NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. DXXXII.

MARCH, 1901.

THE POPE'S CIVIL PRINCEDOM.

BY THE MOST REVEREND JOHN IRELAND, ARCHBISHOP OF ST. PAUL.

Two notable addresses made recently in Rome, one by His Holiness, Leo XIII., in solemn consistory, the other by His Grace, the Duke of Norfolk, Earl Marshal of England, as the spokesman of some hundreds of English pilgrims, give evidence that the lapse of thirty years since the old Aurelian wall of Rome near the Porta Pia crumbled beneath the shot and shell of Italian artillery has not put out of sight the question of the Pope's civil princedom, that this question clamors to-day for a solution as imperiously as at any moment since 1870, and that the one solution to it which will satisfy the Pontiff and the faithful of the Catholic Church is the restoration of the Papacy to its temporal power.

I quote from the address of Leo XIII.:

"Many matters, both disagreeable and sad, press upon us. * * * A source of grief in particular is, that the same force which deprived the Pontiff of his just and legitimate temporal sovereignty, with which was bound up the freedom of his sacred office, still persecutes and continues to hold him subject to an alien domination. Our sense of the bitterness of this injustice was recently renewed by what we saw taking place in the Italian state—that is, when the government of the city, which had been wrongfully secured, was passed on from one to another, as if it had been justly obtained. We complain of the

Copyright, 1901, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

continuance of the grievance; we desire the rights of the Holy See to be safe and intact; we declare they can nowise be interfered with or diminished by a lapse of time or a succession of possessors."

And from the address of the Duke of Norfolk:

"We look forward with hope to this new century, which you, Holy Father, have ushered in with prayer and sacrifice, upholding the claim of Jesus Christ to the allegiance of mankind. * * * We pray and we trust that it may witness the restoration of the Roman Pontiff to that position of temporal independence which Your Holiness has declared necessary for the effective fulfilment of the duties of his world-wide charge."

It will be remarked that both Pope and Duke base the claim of the civil princedom of the Head of the Church upon the exigencies of his spiritual mission. Leo deplores the loss of the temporal sovereignty "with which was bound up the freedom of his sacred office;" and the Duke of Norfolk prays for the restoration of the Pontiff to the position of temporal independence "necessary for the effective fulfilment of his world-wide charge." It is, therefore, the connection between the Pope's possession of temporal power and the exercise of his spiritual jurisdiction that we must consider, if we are to have a correct apprehension of the Roman question, and understand why it is that this question lives, and demands from the twentieth century the solution which it failed to receive from the closing decades of the nineteenth.

I.

The Pope is the sovereign chieftain of a church which its members hold to have been founded by Christ, the Incarnate God, to teach all peoples until the end of time. The Church is a complete organism, possessing in itself the elements of life and the potencies of action, and invested with inherent rights to all means, natural as well as supernatural, that are needed to secure for it dignity before men and liberty for the work with which it is charged. It is a Catholic, a world-church, having humanity as the object of its mission and its operations. It has as its head the Pope, the Bishop of Rome, in whom is centered the supreme consciousness of its powers and rights, and to whom is entrusted the supreme duty of interpreting its mind and guiding its destinies.

The mission of the Church, both in its purpose and in the forces of which it disposes, is spiritual. It reaches out to souls; proffering to them salvation through divine truth and grace.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Spiritual, too, is the mission of the Pope, for it is no other than that of the Church. This mission, however, the Pope exercises upon earth, among men, he himself a man; and thus he is at once brought into contact with human interests and human methods, upon which his mission, spiritual as it is in its primary purport, must in some degree be dependent. The spiritual, to live on earth, must have a foothold on earth. As long as religion works in humanity, the spiritual needs the temporal.

When, therefore, the Pope's civil princedom is brought under discussion, the question really is whether such civil princedom is in a manner necessary to his spiritual mission. So far as it is shown to be necessary to the spiritual, we shall hold that the Church may claim it by right divine. Else, Christ's mission to His church is vain and illusory.

Civil independence, it is urged, is necessary to the Papacy for the fulfilment of its mission. Here, however, a distinction is to be made. No one maintains that civil independence is so essential that without it the Papacy cannot have existence, or cannot in some way, though it be under the stress of most unpropitious circumstances, do its appointed work. In other words, civil independence is not a vital element in the being of the Papacy. It is necessary only in the sense that, without it, the Papacy does not possess the dignity and the freedom which should belong to it as the representative of Christ and the teacher of nations. But will any one assert that it is merely a right to what is vitally essential to its life and its work that the Papacy, the chieftaincy of Christ's Church, received from its Author, or that it was not the intention of its Founder that it should also have that integrity of outward form and the freedom of action required for the exercise of its ministry with dignity and efficiency? Christ was not an unwise or impotent builder. It was, indeed, in the Catacombs of Rome that, in the first ages of Christianity, the Papacy accomplished its work. But it is not in the days of persecution that we expect to behold in the Papacy the normal form which it should bear, or the normal rights which it has received from Christ.

II.

The Pope, all, of course, concede, must have absolute freedom of action in the work of governing the Church and of teaching faith and morals. No hindrance must come to him from human

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agencies; his action, whether in governing or in teaching, must be purely his own, or rather that of the Church, which he represents. Now, to secure such freedom is the purpose of the civil independence of the Pope. Suppose the Pope were to be in subjection to a civil ruler. His freedom, at most, would be a concession from this ruler; nor would there be any certainty that the concession would not be withdrawn. Such ruler would have the power to stay the action of the Pope, to throw countless obstacles in his way, to strive, by threats or promises, to influence him. And who will say that a civil ruler would not often make use of such power? The action of the Pope might be of a nature to offend him; it might mean the repudiation of laws which he had enacted in violation of justice; or the condemnation of iniquitous courses which he followed in his private or public life. The word of the Pope is potent with men and nations, and the control of it, real or seeming, would give valuable aid to a ruler's ambitions. The temptation, either to reduce the Pope to silence, or to give direction to his speech, is so great that, were the opportunity given, many rulers would yield to it. To such a temptation Napoleon yielded, when Pius VII. was temporarily under his dominion; and history tells how, at Savona and Fontainebleau, neither fraud, nor flattery, nor physical violence, was spared to compel the Pontiff to issue, in matters purely ecclesiastical, such edicts as the conqueror's pride and covetousness of supremacy exacted. In the course of centuries, the monarchs had not been few who, if unequal to Napoleon in genius, were equal to him in pride and ambition. What if Popes had been the subjects of such monarchs? What if Clement VII. had been the subject of the King of England, when Henry VIII. called for the annulment of his marriage with Queen Catherine? Or if Gregory VII. had been under the sway of the Emperor of Germany, when Henry IV. undertook to dispose of the crozier of the bishop, as he disposed of the estate of the vassal?

National antipathies and jealousies, so strong and so persistent in the life of humanity, make it imperative that the Head of the Church be not the subject of a civil ruler. Inasmuch as the Catholic Church is a universal church, it is vitally differentiated from other religious societies, and has exigencies to which those of none other can be compared. Because it is the Church of all nations, its supreme chieftain must be of no nation; he must have a ter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ritory of his own, where all nations are at home, where no nation is master. In virtue of his office the Pope is supra-national; for this reason, he must be extra-national. As the subject of one nation, he would be viewed askance by subjects of other nations, who would deny his impartiality or doubt his freedom from undue influence. If war were declared between his master and a foreign sovereign, his own ruler would demand from him active aid, and the foreigner would refuse communication with him. It is to no purpose to draw an abstract line between the spiritual and the temporal, and to expect that nations shall hearken to the Pope as a father in one sphere of action, and repel him as an enemy in another. When minds are inflamed, the aims and objects of the spiritual and of the temporal are easily confounded. If to-day Leo XIII. were the subject of France, how weak would be his moral power in Germany! Had he, by recognizing the sovereignty of the Italian King over Rome, made himself a subject of the Quirinal, he would be bound, as a loyal Italian, to the obligations of the Dreibund, and ineffectual would be his letters to the people of France, whom the Dreibund fain would crush.

The subjection of the Pope to a civil ruler could not but result in the formation of national churches. Humanly speaking, had not the Pope in past ages safeguarded his spiritual authority by civil independence, the Church could not have survived as a Catholic or universal church. History bears witness to the injury done to Catholic unity, towards the close of the Middle Ages, by the prolonged sojourn of the Popes at Avignon. Although at Avignon the Pope was not absolutely deprived of sovereignty, yet the period during which the Papacy was, to a certain extent, under the influence of a French sovereign was commonly styled by German writers "the Captivity of Babylon." As a consequence of the residence of the Popes at Avignon, there sprang up in Western Europe the idea of national churches, opening the way for the Great Schism of the Occident, and, perhaps, for the Protestant Reformation itself.

An independent conscience is the gift of the Christian religion to the world. The day when Christ said: "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and to God the things that are God's," there arose in the world a power that could say to the despot who would fain pass the border of the spiritual world: "Thus far, and no farther!" The despot quickly understood that, in presence

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of such a power, there were limits set to pride and to passion. Again and again was fierce war made upon the Church of Christ because it stood for an independent conscience. Now it was the Byzantine or the German, now the Englishman or the Frenchman, that coveted spiritual power, so as to be absolute master in his dominion. Napoleon writhed in anger before a captive Pope, who held firmly by his spiritual prerogatives. Before Napoleon's time Henry VIII., thwarted in his base courses by the spiritual ruler, declared himself to be the head of the church, at least in his own kingdom. It has been, as it were, an innate passion of civil rulers to be, as the Cæsars of old, supreme in the realm of the spiritual as well as in that of the temporal; they coveted, if not always the name, certainly the power, of the *Pontifex Maximus*. Had resistance not been made to the encroachments of kingly power upon spiritual rights, liberty had perished, not only the liberty of conscience, but, also, the liberty of civil society.

And it is the Pope who, as Head of Christ's Church, withstood during the ages the assaults of the temporal upon the spiritual. Had there been no Pope, it is plain to the student of history that independence of conscience would have been destroyed beneath the fell blows of despotic rulers. Whenever a monarch, drunk with power, undertook to sacrifice family purity to lust, or the welfare of the people to pride and greed, a Pope—a Gregory. an Innocent, an Alexander, an Urban—rose up in the name of conscience and drove back the aggressor.

But could Popes have wielded freely and successfully their moral power, in defense of right against tyrants, if they had been civil subjects of such monarchs, or of their friends, or of their enemies? The Popes were strong because, in virtue of their civil independence, they were supra-national, above all nations, above all monarchs. If to-day in the world, Catholic and non-Catholic, there is respect for conscience, it is due to the Papacy, which in past times fought so nobly the battles of conscience, and to the civil independence of the Papacy, which enabled the Popes to fight these battles with success. Will this respect for conscience always and everywhere survive, if its defense be left to the individual, and no general representative of its rights be enthroned so high above all combatants that he may speak and act with fullest liberty? This is a question upon which thinking men may well ponder. How far imperialism might go, or might wish to go,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

towards the enslavement of the spiritual, we can judge from Prussia under Bismarck's May laws, or from Russia under the workings of the Holy Synod. In the future, as in the past, for the defense of conscience the world will need the Pope; and the Pope, to defend the supremacy of conscience, will need civil independence. It was considerations such as these that one day brought Monsieur Thiers to speak to France a truth most profound, however paradoxical the form under which he clothed it: "In order that the spiritual and the temporal remain separated elsewhere in the world, in Rome they must be united."

III.

The history of churches other than the Catholic Church shows that, when hierarchs fall under subjection to the civil power, they lose their freedom in the exercise of their spiritual ministry, and that they never could extend their authority so as to become world-bishops. After his separation from Rome, the Patriarch of Constantinople sank rapidly to the low estate of a mere instrument of political power in the hands of the Emperor, and the Emperor ruled the church as despotically as he ruled the state. The extension of the Patriarch's spiritual domain would have been construed by other nations as an attempt to extend the temporal domain of the Emperor. At first, Moscow acknowledged the spiritual jurisdiction of Constantinople; but, as Russia grew into consciousness of nationhood, it threw off its allegiance to a foreign Pontiff.

Separated from Constantinople, the Patriarch of Moscow was, in name, at least, the ruler of the Russian Orthodox Church. But, in turn, he became the creature of the civil power. The Holy Synod of St. Petersburg, with its mixed membership of laymen and ecclesiastics, as much dependent on the Czar as the Department of War, or that of Foreign Affairs, governs the church in European and Asiatic Russia, appointing and dismissing bishops and priests, regulating rites and ceremonies, and tracing out lines of demarcation betwen orthodoxy and heresy. Imagine the Patriarch of Moscow striving for a world-episcopate, coveting spiritual jurisdiction over Slavic populations in Austria and Turkey, where governments are already so jealous of Russophile tendencies!

No less striking is the example of the Church of England. Of that church the Archbishop of Canterbury is the primate. What

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

authority did the Archbishop of Canterbury have under Henry, under Elizabeth, or under any of their successors? The Church of England is governed by the King, the Privy Council, the Parliament. In spite of occasional protests from High-Churchman or from Ritualist, the Church of England has been and remains essentially Erastian—as so clearly witness, for instance, the decisions in the Gorham case, and in that of the authors of the "Essays and Reviews." The dream, if ever such a dream could be entertained, of making the primate of the Church of England a world-bishop is at once seen to be ludicrous. A Pan-Anglican church could not hope to embrace in its fold even the Episcopalians of Ireland, or of America.

Historians and statesmen rise from the study of human interests and of international politics, with the conviction that the Pope, representing a world-church and a universal religion, cannot, with due respect for his own office, or consistently with the peace of nations, be the subject of a civil ruler. "I was once of opinion," writes Ranke, the Protestant historian of the Papacy, "that it would be good to separate the spiritual wholly from the temporal power; but I have learned that the Pope, without the patrimony of Peter, would be nothing more than the slave of kings and princes." In 1849 Lord Lansdowne, addressing the British House of Lords, did not hesitate to maintain that, "There was no country with Catholic subjects and Catholic possessions, which had not a deep interest in the Pope being so placed as to be able to exercise his authority unfettered and unshackled by any temporal influence which might affect his spiritual authority." In the same year, and before the same exalted assembly, Lord Brougham declared: "My opinion is that it will not do to say that the Pope is all very well as a spiritual prince, but that we ought not to restore his temporal power. For, what would be the consequence? Stripped of that secular dominion he would become the slave, now of one Power, then of another. * * * His temporal power is a European, not a local one; and the Pope's authority should be maintained for the sake of peace and of the interest of Europe." And, in 1864, when not yet bound by the imaginary logic of accomplished facts, Signor Crispi himself, who has recently been Prime Minister of Italy, announced in open Parliament in Florence: "The Roman Pontiff cannot be the citizen of a great state, descending from the throne on which the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Catholic world pays him homage. He must be prince and master in his own domain, second to none."

More emphatically still than historians and statesmen does the Church itself, with its intimate consciousness of its needs, and its paramount claim to be heard in its own defense, proclaim the necessity of the civil independence of its supreme Pontiff, and his right to this independence. Every Pope would re-echo the words, which, in 1887, Leo XIII. addressed to Cardinal Rampolla, his secretary of state: "We have ever, as in duty bound, claimed a real sovereignty for the Roman Pontiff, not from ambition, or for worldly glory, but as a true and efficacious guarantee of his independence and freedom." And every bishop would subscribe to the declaration made to Pius IX. by the hundreds of prelates, assembled in Rome, in 1862: "We recognize the civil princedom of the Holy See as a necessary institution and as manifestly founded by the Providence of God; and we do not hesitate to declare that, in the present condition of human things, this civil princedom is altogether requisite to the salutary and free government of the Church and of souls. For, the head of the whole Church must be subject to no sovereign, the honored guest of none; but be established in his own domain and his own princedom, and be in every respect his own master."

IV.

Hence, in the political occurrences which, in the days when modern Christendom was being built upon the ruins of the Roman Empire, led to the civil sovereignty of the Pope, Catholics have seen the guiding hand of Providence.

From the Roman Forum there went out the highways which led to the remotest frontiers of a mighty empire, universal in its scope, and almost universal in its extent. Over them marched with the Roman legions, the learning, the art, the commerce of Rome. The milestones, whose numerals the wayfarer read in his progress, proclaimed the distance of cities and tribes from Rome, and measured their importance and their culture. Rome's "royal nobleness" marked her out as the worthy seat of the mighty empire that began on the plains of Judea and Galilee—an empire which, though in an entirely different order, was destined to be greater than the empire of the Cæsars had ever been—to be, in fact, what Rome's temporal empire had striven in vain to be, an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

empire universal and eternal. Of this new empire, Peter held the sceptre; and in Rome he placed the seat of its power. "As in the designs of Providence," writes Leo XIII., "all human events have been ordered towards Christ and his Church, so ancient Rome and its empire were founded for the sake of Christian Rome." Rome's empire appeared in Daniel's vision the greatest, as it was the last of the five great empires which were to precede and emblematize the Empire of Christ. The city of Rome itself had been declared by its seers and poets the *"Urbs Aeterna,"* the Eternal City; the fated destiny of whose sons was to rule the universe:

"Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento."

What was seen in vision by Hebrew prophet, and foretold by Roman seer, was to be fulfilled in the Fisherman of Galilee.

And so did it come to pass that, when the Church had attained its normal form and stature, its Supreme Pontiff, the successor of Peter, was found to be dowered with civil independence and civil sovereignty.

From the days of Pepin—indeed, from a much earlier date—the Pope was the ruler of Rome. On the twentieth day of September, 1870, the armies of Victor Emmanuel took forcible possession of the city and made it the capital of Italy.

The occupation of Rome took place despite Victor Emmanuel's solemn assurance that he would respect the city of the Popes, and without the concurrence of the Roman people. When, in 1860, Victor Emmanuel was invading Umbria and the Marches, he recognized that all law, divine and civil, forbade his going to Rome, and in a public proclamation he made the statement: "I intend to respect the seat of the chief of the Church, to whom I am willing to give, together with the allied and friendly Powers, all the guarantees of independence and security." That the Italian occupation of Rome took place without the concurrence of the Roman people, is freely admitted even by those who are no advocates of the Pope's temporal power. "Rome had been won," writes Mr. Bolton King, in his "History of Italian Unity," "but not as they would have wished it; it was not through the great rising of a people, or because Europe and the Papacy had bowed of free will to the principle of nationality. The accident of European policies had brought the Italians there." The Roman plebiscite by which the Italian Government afterwards endeavored

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to give to its conquest the appearance of popular approval, has never been regarded otherwise than as a daring political farce.

V.

Against the Italian occupation of Rome the Pope unceasingly protests. As Supreme Head of the Church the Pope cannot do otherwise. The question of the civil independence of the Holy See is a question of principle. The civil independence of the Pope is an inherent need, and, consequently, an inherent right of the Church. The enjoyment of this, as of other rights of the Church, may, through stress of circumstances and the interference of men, be interrupted, for periods of time, more or less prolonged. But the right itself, no series of events, no power of men takes away; and the Pope, as the Church's ruler and guardian, must defend it. Were he to remain silent, while despoiled of his civil independence, he would implicitly acquiesce in the violation of principle; he would sacrifice a sacred right of the Church, and would become an unwise and unjust steward.

Moreover, in the present condition of the Papacy, the sole safeguard of the Pope's spiritual independence is continuous protest. As long as he protests, so long is he free and independent; as long as he does not become a subject of the Italian kingdom, so long is he the unfettered world-bishop, with dignity unimpaired. No jealousies are aroused in other nations; no fears are entertained that he be constrained or influenced. Had the Pope accepted the proffered annuity of three million lire, had he consented to pass, escorted by royal dragoons through the streets of Rome, to render a subject's fealty at the court of the Quirinal, he would have become in the eyes of the world the salaried official of Italy, the court-chaplain of Italy's sovereign. His moral influence as Pontiff would have been at an end. The *"Vatican intransigenza,"* as his enemies term Leo's attitude towards the Quirinal, is now the only possible safeguard to the independence and dignity of the Pope.

No doubt, during Leo's pontificate, the prestige of the Papacy has been greater than it had been at any other period of the nineteenth century. From this, the adversaries of Papal civil independence infer that the Papacy has received from the Italian Government all the concessions of liberty which it needs, and that it prospers best when liberated from temporal responsiblities. This

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is a conclusion without foundation in fact. It is Leo's personal character that has reflected new lustre upon the Papacy in these later years; it is his greatness of mind and heart, which, in face of all obstacles, has won the homage of the world. The Papacy to-day is more illustrious than before, not because of, but in spite of, the loss of temporal power.

They who counsel reconciliation between the Vatican and the Quirinal, on the basis of the Pope's recognition of the sovereignty of the King over Rome, overlook the vital point at issue—the principle which, as Head of the Church, Leo can never yield—namely, that the spiritual independence of the Pope, to be effective and enduring, requires, as its guarantee, civil independence.

The situation with which the Pope is now confronted is intolerable. In the streets of Rome, insult has been offered to the cortege conveying to its last resting-place in San Lorenzo the dead body of Leo's predecessor. A statue has been erected in one of the public squares in honor of an excommunicated monk, whose sole merit was that in his day he had been the enemy of the Papacy. The head of the municipal government has been dismissed from office by ministerial decree because, on an occasion when the Catholic world was honoring Leo as a man and as a Pontiff, he dared to send to the Vatican the expression of his good will and of that of his colleagues. The charitable institutions of the city, legacies of the Catholic charity of ages, have been wrested from the control of the Church and handed over to the secular authorities. Monasteries and schools have been closed and the buildings confiscated. By veto of the Italian Government, Leo XIII. has been forbidden to send an envoy to an international peace congress, where he would have been welcomed even by non-Catholic sovereigns, and where the Pope, by all the prerogatives of his office and all the traditions of his see, was entitled to be represented. It may, indeed, be urged that a treaty of reconciliation between Pope and King might secure the Pontiff against such violations of justice and public decency. But can a treaty guarantee that concessions so secured will be abiding and irrevocable? "Independence through concession," to quote Leo himself, "may be withdrawn by him who bestowed it; those who yesterday sanctioned it, may annul it to-morrow." How dependent the Pope would be, were his rights secured only by concessions, is un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

derstood from the confession of Signor Ricciotti Garibaldi, in a late number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW: "The Papacy in Italy exists only by the permission of the Italian Parliament." Mere concessions, of their very nature, cannot suffice; for concessions, as such, presuppose that the Head of the Church can be a subject.

The sole solution of the Roman question is the Pope's civil princedom; and, until this is recovered, the Pope's protest will continue.

VI.

The barriers raised against the recovery of the Pope's civil princedom are by no means so insuperable as at first glance they may appear. Italy took from the Pope his civil princedom; why cannot Italy be expected to restore it? To do so would mean for Italy peace, prosperity and glory. No one can fail to sympathize with that love for the beautiful peninsula which, in 1849, drew the hearts of its population to the banners of Charles Albert, as he waved them in defiant hatred of the foreigners who were occupying Italian soil; no one will refuse to wish, with the Italian poet, that Italy had been either *"Meno bella, piu forte,"* so that it might have escaped incursions of Iberian, Gaul, and Teuton, and have been in the past something more than a geographical expression. But the possession of Rome was not necessary to a freed or a united Italy. Italy had no historic claim to Rome; ancient Rome had not belonged to Italy any more than to other lands which ancient Rome had conquered. Moreover, the honor, the welfare of Italy, and above all else, the honor and the welfare of the universal Church, whose rights Italy had graver reasons than other nations to defend, demanded that Rome remain outside the borders of the new commonwealth. Rome should have been deemed "intangible;" the Providential home of the spiritual sovereign should have been respected. Many of Italy's statesmen were of this way of thinking, and wished to retain the seat of government in Florence. Unfortunately, the thoughtless popular passion of the moment triumphed. Justice and religion were trampled under the feet of the Italian soldiery; and an era of hopeless internal suffering and weakness opened for the nation.

The situation is to-day no less intolerable for Italy than it is for the Papacy. The court of the King is obscured by that of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Pope. Rome persists in being Papal, in deriving its life and grandeur from the Papacy. Throughout the kingdom, Italians are divided. The adherents of the Pope's temporal power are legion. They are, too, the most conservative elements of the population, and as they refrain, in obedience to the Pope's order, from active participation in national politics, the peril daily grows that the socialistic and revolutionary elements in the country may obtain control of public affairs. Through fear of Papal claims, the government is compelled to impose on the country, much against the country's deepest wishes, the burden of an oppressive militarism, and of an unnatural and unhistoric alliance with Austria and Prussia. No country could hope for permanent peace and prosperity under conditions of this nature. All Italians realize this, all clamor for deliverance of one kind or another. Meanwhile, the Papal cause will necessarily be gaining ground for this reason, if for no other, that the Italian people are profoundly Catholic, and will remain Catholic in every fibre of their souls, as long as they are Italians. And once the heat of political passion is cooled, and it is more plainly seen that Papal independence is a religious, not a political, matter, the proper solution to the Roman question will be given by Italy itself. Time may be required; but the Papacy has the patience of an eternal institution.

On higher grounds, however, than a consideration of the conditions of Italy do Catholics rest their hope of a restoration of Papal independence. Were the conditions of Italy ever so adverse, Catholics are calm and strong in their expectations. They have the enduring confidence that, whatever the conditions in Italy are to-day, or may be to-morrow, those conditions will, in Providence's own good time, be so altered as to allow the Papacy to regain its rights.

Since the Church is from Christ, and one of its requirements for the proper fulfilment of its spiritual mission is the civil independence of its Head, the present "Captivity of Babylon" will not continue; the Pope will regain his civil princedom.

Non-Catholic readers of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW may not admit the premises upon which Catholics are building. They will, however, I believe, concede that once those premises are granted, the Catholic position regarding the temporal power is the only logical one.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And, furthermore, I venture to say that, as they recall what they have read of the conflicts and triumphs of the Church in past ages, they will be slow to reject as impossible, or improbable, the statement that some day, be it sooner or later, the world will again see the Pope in possession of his civil princedom, and Rome once more the free international city of the Christian world.

JOHN IRELAND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MUSINGS UPON CURRENT TOPICS.—II.

BY BENJAMIN HARRISON, FORMERLY PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

BRITISH ALLIANCE.

THE newspapers, British and American, were much occupied during last winter with a supposed, or proposed, Anglo-American alliance, more or less formal in character. We know that no such convention was signed, and no evidence has been produced to show that the subject was even informally discussed by the representatives of the respective nations. Mr. Chamberlain was premature and incautious in giving out what seemed to be an announcement.

Every one must admit that a close friendship between the United States and Great Britain is quite desirable, and quite in the course of nature. However complex our population may be in the matter of origin, if we have any derived national type it is English. This predisposition to friendship, however, is not because of birth-ties felt by our generation. These tend, perhaps, more strongly in other directions. English nativity, as a direct influence in American life, is now comparatively small. But, as a remote and indirect influence, it has been the preponderating element in the evolution of the American. The thirteen colonies were English colonies, not only in their governmental relations, but in fact. The Scot and the Irishman and the Welshman, for the most part, made their salutations to the New World in the English tongue. They came as English-speaking people. Their accent was, at home, only an unavailing protest against absorption. The accent fell away here; it was not needed. A more effective protest against English political domination was found. As free Americans, they had no quarrel with the English tongue. Whatever has come since to the United States has been grafted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon the old English root. The fruit has, we think, been improved, but the *genus* is still that of the old root.

The Scot, the Irishman, the Welshman, the German, the Frenchman, the Hollander, the Dane, the Swede, the Norwegian, has each brought a contribution, and the Italian is now offering one. The American is a give-and-take product. But "thy speech bewrayeth thee"—and our speech is wholly, and our derived institutions are chiefly, English. We have pride in the great poets, philosophers, jurists, historians and story-writers who have used the tongue we use, and we are grateful to them. It is a personal debt.

We have fellowship with the stout Britons who sheared the prerogatives of the King, and with the martyrs who died for freedom of worship. We are grateful to *them,* not to the government that persecuted them. But is it logical to derive from such considerations the deduction that our sympathies must be given to every British Ministry that inaugurates a war, without reference to its origin or its justice? We did not take English literature or English law by voluntary conveyance, upon a consideration of love and affection. Will not the argument for a friendly spirit toward Great Britain be stronger, if the plea of gratitude is made less of? For gratitude takes account, not of one incident, but of all; and the average between 1774 and 1898 had better not be struck. There may be found more things that it would be pleasant to forget than to remember!

Prior to the Spanish-American war, can the historian find, in British-American diplomatic intercourse, an instance where friendship for the United States led to any substantial abatement of British pretensions, or to a sympathetic attitude toward us in the times of our stress and agony, or even to the use of any special consideration in presenting a demand for redress? The demand for the release of Mason and Slidell was couched in very harsh and peremptory terms. And it is understood that, but for the kindly intervention of the Queen, an abasement would have been put upon us that we could only have accepted with a time reservation—until our fleets and armies had finished the work in hand.

The attitude of the British Government toward us during our Civil War was hostile and hurtful. Its unfriendliness only stopped short of an open alliance with the Southern Confederacy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Neither kinship nor a history of ostentatious reprobation of slavery was enough to overbalance the commercial advantage to be derived from trade with a non-manufacturing, cotton-raising nation. The threatening attitude of Great Britain was no small part of the breaking burden that weighted the shoulders of Abraham Lincoln. Only the Lancashire spinners—God bless them to the latest generation!—showed an embodied friendship; though there were notable sporadic cases.

Is it quite logical to use the recent display of friendliness by Great Britain as a sponge with which to wipe from the tablets of memory the decisive intervention of France during the Revolution, and the helpful friendliness of Russia during the Civil War? Or should the sponge only be used to efface any rancorous memory of old manifestations of unfriendliness by Great Britain toward us, or by us toward her, and to give us a clean slate upon which may be recorded an unbroken future of kindliness and good will?

Washington did not allow gratitude to France, for an armed and saving intervention in our behalf, to be used as the basis of an alliance that would bring us into European entanglements; and can we now allow the friendly non-intervention of Great Britain during the Spanish war—which involved no cost to her—to be so used? The French demands upon our gratitude were thought to be excessive, though they did not insist upon a permanent naval base in New York Harbor!

Are not the continuous good and close relations of the two great English-speaking nations—for which I pray—rather imperilled than promoted by this foolish talk of gratitude and of an alliance, which is often made to take on the appearance of a threat, or at least a prophecy, of an Anglo-Saxon "paramountcy?"

The prophetic rôle, also, is being overworked. There is no emotion so susceptible to overwork as gratitude, and no rôle so silly as that of a prophet without an attestation. Is it not wholly illogical to argue that, because the British Ministry, and, to a considerable degree, the British people, gave their sympathy to us during the Spanish war, an American administration and the American people must give their sympathy to the British in the Boer war? The major premise is wanting—namely, that the two wars are of the same quality. The argument we hear so much takes no account of this element; yet it is necessary, to save the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deduction, that both wars should be just or that both should be unjust. There are evidences, however, that this reasoning is accepted by many intelligent persons. I say "reasoning." Perhaps that is not a good word. It certainly is not unless we start with this major premise—"Both wars were righteous wars;" or this—"Both wars were aggressive, for dominion." If our Spanish war was waged to liberate an oppressed people, and the British-Boer war is waged to subjugate a free people, does not the "reasoning" fail? For, to say that we must stand by Great Britain in the wrong because she stood by us in the right is not reasoning—it is the *camaraderie* of brigands. It must be admitted, however, that, should we present a claim of "suzerainty" or "paramountcy" over Cuba, a similitude to the South African situation might be found.

Is not the sympathy of Great Britain robbed of all moral quality, if we allow that it had its origin in any other consideration than a belief in the justice of our cause? It is to disparage the nation whose virtues and civilization we affect to honor, to say that Great Britain stood by us in a war that her conscience did not approve; that she kept off the police, while we effected a robbery. And the depths of moral darkness are sounded when it is suggested that we are to make return in kind.

Does not a flood of gush and unreason rather thwart than promote a good understanding? There will be an ebb. Neither the British people nor the American people will surrender their right of free judgment and criticism of the acts of their own government, much less of the acts and policies of the other. Surely, every American speaker and writer is not now *perforce* either a supporter of Mr. Chamberlain's aggressive colonial policies, or an ingrate. Our freedom of judgment and criticism is surely not smaller than that of a Liberal Member of Parliament. Government in Great Britain, even more than in the United States, is by party, and the control shifts. Is it not too hard a test of friendliness to say that each must shift its sympathies when the majority in the other shifts?

A *quid pro quo* friendship between nations had some promise of permanency, and some value, in the days when kings were rulers and there was an anointed line. But, in these days, must not an international friendship, to have value, unite two peoples? Ministries and Presidents are shifting quantities. A friendship

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that comes in with a Ministry or a President may go out with it or him. Only a union of the two peoples is worthy of a statesman's thought; and not incidents of friendliness, but an agreement in matters of principle, in general governmental purposes, is needed for that.

We take our friends on the average, as they must take us. If the liberty to differ is not reserved, I am not a friend, but a toady. A man who is capable of a high friendship will not mention the favor he did you last week, when he solicits your help. Lending to those from whom you expect to receive as much again, is not friendship, but commerce. If friendship is put upon that basis, it becomes open to bids; and account must be taken of the extremity when aid was given or withheld.

I think the great weight of opinion among the English Liberals was that the war with the Dutch Republics could have been, and ought to have been, avoided. Many of them believe that this war is only a supplement of the Jameson raid. Surely an American may hold these opinions without subjecting himself to the charge that he is a hater of Great Britain. Nor can the repression which the British Liberals have imposed upon themselves, pending the war, be exacted of Americans. Nations can only be reached by process from two tribunals—war and public opinion. The Arbitral Tribunal has no process; it assembles upon a stipulation. The Tribunal of Public Opinion, on the other hand, is always in session, and must give a judgment upon all acts of men and nations that affect the public welfare. It would aid the Tribunal greatly if each of the combatants could be compelled to plead, to declare the cause of the war and its objects.

The Continental Congress of 1776 allowed the jurisdiction of this great court. "A decent respect," it said, "for the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation." The object of the war was stated with equal explicitness: "That these United Colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent states."

In our second war with Great Britain, the messages of President Madison and the resolutions of Congress distinctly catalogue the causes of the war and disclose its objects, and in our Civil War the issue was so clear that neither malice nor sophistry has been able to confuse it. Mr. Lincoln consciously and willingly submitted the cause to "the considerate judgment of mankind."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the recent Spanish war, Congress declared not only the cause of the war, but put the United States under bond to conduct and conclude it as a war for the liberation of Cuba.

There is no influence for peace so strong (would it were freer and stronger!) as the fear of the enlightened judgment of mankind. And this must put those who influence that judgment upon the exercise of a judicial independence and impartiality. These judgments must not be made matters of exchange. Is it not bad morals, as well as illogical, to say: "We were recently at the bar of public opinion, and Great Britain, as one of the judges, stood by us; now she is at the bar, and we must stand by her?"

There are no two countries in the world where thought and conscience and speech, the elements and the organ of a sound public opinion, are so free or so powerful as in Great Britain and the United States. And no friendship between the nations, that does not take account of and allow these, is a worthy one, or can have endurance. In the case of one's own country, there has been opportunity to influence public policies, and if they have gone wrong there will be an opportunity to set them right; while, in the case of another nation, we are without opportunity.

Is not the inevitable tendency of any attempt to put Great Britain and the United States in the relation of allies, to raise up and to strengthen an anti-British party in the United States and an anti-American party in Great Britain? Buried injuries and grudges are dug up and exploited for a domestic party advantage. There are forces that become destructive if they are pent; and, in this regard, opinions and gunpowder are in the same class. If a friendship between Great Britain and the United States, that will make their immediate relations cordial and unite their influence for peace and human progress, is to be maintained—to become a status—must it not be laid down on a moral instead of a commercial basis? Morals abide; commercial interests shift. It must not involve enmity to the world, or exact an approval by the one of every public act of the other. It must not be put upon grounds too tenuously sentimental, nor must the *quid pro quo* argument be too much pressed. It must be of a sort that tolerates differences of opinions and endures the smart of criticism. The newspapers must not be taken too seriously. The friendship must not be of a party here with a party there. Upon that basis we shall have racking alternations of gush and coldness.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If the nations are to be friends, if they are to live together in amity and work together in their foreign policies, must it not be upon a basis that does not repel but invites the participation of all other nations, in every project for the development and peace of the world—and not upon the pernicious and futile project of an Anglo-Saxon world? The moral quality of public acts must be taken account of; greed of territory and thoughts of political paramountcies enforced by the sword must be eliminated.

Great Britain has pursued aggressively a policy of territorial expansion, in which the consent of the peoples taken over has not been taken account of, as having any application, until after British sovereignty was established. If the Dutch will forego all thoughts of a lost republic and become loyal subjects of Great Britain, she will give back to them a pretty large liberty in local affairs, and take a very large credit for her generosity. She has not regarded the forcible annexation of territory as at all culpable.

Is the friendly co-operation of the two nations to be rested upon the abandonment or modification of her traditional policy, or upon the abandonment of ours? In the prosecution of the "open door" policy—that is, equal commercial privileges to all nations—we have, perhaps, found a common basis of diplomatic action. To us this means, I still think, the recognition of the autonomy of weak nations and their right to regulate their own internal affairs, as opposed to dismemberment or the paramountcy of one of the great Powers. Does Great Britain accept the "open door" policy in that sense? And is it with her a world or only a Chinese policy? Are we agreed that the seizure or dismemberment of a weak state by a stronger is wrong, or only that, in the case of China, an agreed partition would be difficult, or that it might be less advantageous?

Is it not possible that, if suitably urged, Great Britain might come to stand with us against the forcible absorption of weak states and for open doors everywhere? She has lost her monopoly of expansion. She has found that her most loyal colonies buy in the best market. The people of the Transvaal and of the Orange Free State will not show favor to a British trade-mark. The increased cost and competition in the business of expansion are suggestive.

The American people gave generously of their love to Queen Victoria. Her death was felt here to be a family sorrow. She

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was not associated in the American mind with those aggressive features of the British character and foreign policy that other nations have so much resented. The American love for her as a Queen was largely based upon the belief that her influence was used, as far as it might be, to ameliorate aggression and to promote peace. The qualities we most admired in her were those in which she was most unlike some British statesmen, whose names my readers are left to catalogue. The universal sorrow and sympathy which the death of the Queen evoked in this country, has largely confounded and silenced those who have been saying that America hated Great Britain. It is not so. But will it not be wise to allow the friendship between the nations to rest upon deep and permanent things, and to allow dissent and criticism as to transient things? Irritations of the cuticle must not be confounded with heart failure.

THE BOER WAR.

It is quite possible that the government of a state may so flagrantly abuse its internal powers, may so cruelly treat its subjects, or a class of them, that the intervention of other states will be justified. It is an extreme case that will justify an armed intervention, and the intervention must always be benevolent, both in spirit and purpose. The police must not appropriate the property they recover from the highwayman. The judgment whether the case is one that justifies intervention must not be influenced, or seem to be influenced, by motives of advantage. If the land delivered is taken over, those who reject altogether the idea of an international benevolence or altruism will have another citation.

The insistence of many individuals and of a very large section of the newspaper press that, as matter of "reciprocity," we must give our sympathy to Great Britain in the Boer war, and the frequent references to certain crude and illiberal things in the Dutch administration of the Transvaal as matters justifying an armed intervention by Great Britain, have very naturally turned my vagrant thoughts to the consideration of the question, whether these alleged faults in the internal administration of the Boers furnished a justification for the war made by Great Britain upon the Boers. I put it that way, though I am not ignorant of the fact that the official view in Great Britain is that the Boers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

began the war, and that this view is adopted by the "reciprocity" school of Americans. Is it not possible, however, that the Texas view of the matter is more nearly the right one? In Texas, when one of the parties to an acrimonious, oral discussion announces that the discussion is ended and that he will now take such measures as seem to him to be more effective, and accompanies this declaration by a movement of his right hand in the direction of his hip pocket, *he* is accounted to have begun the war. If the other gets out his weapon first and kills the gentleman whose hand is moving toward his hip pocket, it is, not only in the popular judgment, but in law, self-defense.

The Boers did not seek war with Great Britain. They retreated to the wall. Like the Pilgrims of Plymouth Rock, they did not seek, in the great trek of 1835, an Eldorado, but barrenness and remoteness—a region which, as Mr. Prentiss said, "would hold out no temptation to cupidity, no inducement to persecution."

The Pilgrims found, but the Boers missed, their quest. What seemed a barren veldt, on which freemen might live unmolested, was but the lid of a vast treasure-box. Riches are the destruction of the weak. "When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace." But strong is in the positive; and this scripture tells us what happens when a stronger shall "come upon him."

Taking the case there, however, as one of British armed intervention for the correction of certain alleged evils and oppressions of Transvaal internal administration, what has international law to say about it? But is there an international law? The nations have never subscribed any codification. There are commentators, but no statute book. There are conventions between two or more states, which, in a few specified particulars, regulate rights and conduct. There are the moral law, the Decalogue, the law of nature; but does the "thou" of these address itself to states? There are precedents, but is the nation that made them bound by them, if her interest has shifted? Does the admiral of the strongest fleet write the law of the sea, not only for his antagonist, but for all neutrals? Is there a standard of personal cleanliness and domestic sanitation that is determinative of the right of self-government? Has a strong power the right to appoint itself a "trustee for humanity," and in that character to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

take over the lands of such weak nations as fail to make the best use of them? Is the rule that the trustee cannot take a profit inapplicable to "trustees for humanity?" Does a well-grounded fear that another nation is about to appropriate territory to which neither it nor we have any rightful claim, justify us in grabbing it first, or in making an equivalent seizure in some other part of the world? Have we come, in practice, to the view which Phillimore puts into the mouth of those who say there is no international law:

> "The proposition that in their mutual intercourse States are bound to recognize the eternal obligations of justice, apart from considerations of immediate expediency, they deem stupid and ridiculous pedantry. They point triumphantly to the instances in which the law has been broken, in which might has been substituted for right, and ask if Providence is not always on the side of the strongest battalions. Let our strength, they say, be the law of justice, for that which is feeble is found to be nothing worth."

That choleric Virginia statesman, John Randolph, in 1800, when the subject of Great Britain's infractions of our neutral rights upon the sea was under discussion, gave voice to the same thought. "What is national law," he said, "but national power guided by national interest?" And a recent Chinese writer says: "International law is a set of precepts laid down by strong Powers to be enforced on weak ones."

Many questions relating to natural rights are now regarded as outside the domain of practical statesmanship. Has the American view changed? When we were feeble, questions that are now rather sneeringly called "academic" were very practical, and the aspirations and sympathies that are now called "sentimental" were the breath of American life. Our diplomacy was sentimental; it had a regard for weakness, for we had not forgotten our own. Never did we fail to let it be known that our people sympathized with every effort, every aspiration, of any civilized people to set up or to defend republican institutions.

The British intervention in South Africa was not a response to any appeal from so much as a fragment of the Boer people. They were not only content with the government they had instituted, but passionately devoted to it—with a readiness to die in its defence that took no account of age or sex. No Boer in the Transvaal desired to become a British subject; but very many British subjects in the Cape Colony were so unappreciative of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the advantages of their condition as such that they passionately desired to throw it off for a citizenship in a Dutch Republic. In other words, the men who were discontented and rebellious were not the citizens of the Transvaal or of the Orange Free State, but those men of Dutch descent whose grandfathers had by conquest become British subjects.

The political conditions in Cuba, when we intervened, were the very opposite of those in the Transvaal. Our intervention was in behalf of the Cubans. We co-operated to free them from the power of a government whose oppressions and cruelties had many times before driven them into rebellion.

Great Britain's intervention in South Africa was against a united people, living in content—an ignorant content, if you please—under a government of their own construction; and the ground of the intervention was ostensibly the interests of British subjects sojourning there.

Many defects, incongruities and crudities in the Boer government and administration have been pointed out by the newspapers and other writers of Great Britain, and these have been faithfully echoed by not a few Americans, and by not a few American newspapers. Now, these faults in Boer administration, in the main, were such as affected only the Boers themselves, and were not infractions of the international rights of aliens. The use made of them was not, openly, as a justification of the war, but rather as a check upon the sympathy of the American people, which, it was feared, might, as it has been in the habit of doing, go over-strongly to the side of a republic fighting for its existence. It was to say: "Don't make too much fuss over the death of the man, or too strict an inquiry into the cause of the quarrel; he was not in all respects an exemplary citizen." The Boers were said to have been favorable to slavery as an institution, and to bear a grudge against the British because they abolished it. Now, the American, whose country, until very recently, was the great slave-holding nation of the world, and the Briton, who gave his sympathy, and much material help besides, to the States that sought by the destruction of the American Union to make slavery perpetual—surely these cannot be expected to respect the autonomy or mourn the demise of a republic that is suspected of having had in the past a desire to hold slaves!

These Boers are not our kind of people; they are not polished;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they neglect the bath; they are rude and primitive; their government is patriarchal and, in some things, arbitrary. To be sure, they like these habits and these institutions; they abandoned old homes, and made new homes in the wilderness, that they might enjoy them; but the homes are not such as we would have made; the Anglo-Saxon model has not been nicely followed. You have the "consent of the governed"—yes; but Great Britain does not approve of you, and she stood by us in the Spanish war.

That any self-respecting government, which was strong enough to make its diplomatic notes express its true emotions, would have answered Great Britain's complaints by a flat refusal to discuss them, on the ground that they related to matters of internal administration. That such would have been the answer of the United States, if we had stood in the place of the Transvaal Republic, cannot be doubted—and there is no more room for doubt that the answer would have terminated the discussion.

If the subject of naturalization is not a matter to be determined by a nation for itself, and solely upon a consideration of its own interests and safety, there is no subject that is free from the meddlesome intervention of other states.

And as to the government monopoly of the dynamite trade, the practice of European governments has certainly placed that question in the schedule of internal affairs, resting, in the judgment of each nation, upon a view of its own interests, unless it has by treaty limited its control of the matter.

The idea of a war waged to enforce, as an international right, the privilege of British subjects to renounce their allegiance to the Queen, and to assume a condition in which they might be obliged to take up arms against her, would be a taking theme for a comic opera. And the interest and amusement would be greatly promoted if the composer should, in the opening act, introduce the "Ruler of the Queen's Navy" overhauling an American merchantman in 1812, and dragging from her decks men who *had* renounced their allegiance to Great Britain to become American citizens, to man the guns of British warships!

"If he produced naturalization papers," says McMaster, "from the country under whose flag he sailed, he was told that England did not admit the right of expatriation."

But, in those days, the "renunciation" was sincere and final. The men who made it meant it—meant to fight the King of Great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain, if war came. Did these Transvaal Britons, who were seeking Boer naturalization, mean that? Did Mr. Chamberlain suppose that he was turning over to Mr. Krüger a body of Englishmen skilled in engineering and the use of explosives, upon whose loyalty to the Boer cause Mr. Krüger could rely? The climax of the fun will be reached when the opera composer offers this situation. Most of these men whose naturalization was to be forced upon the Boers were actively and aggressively hostile to the Boer government. No safe occasion to show this hostility was missed.

In a recent book, Mrs. Lionel Phillips, the wife of one of the Englishmen condemned to death for their connection with the Jameson raid, tells of an incident that occurred at Pretoria before the raid. A British Commissioner, Sir Henry Loch, came to Pretoria to discuss with President Krüger some British grievances. Mr. Krüger drove in his carriage to receive the Commissioner and take him to his hotel. Mrs. Phillips says:

"There was a scene of the wildest enthusiasm, thousands being there to welcome the Queen's representative, and when he and Krüger got into the carriage (which also contained Dr. Leyds) to proceed to the hotel some Englishmen took out the horses and dragged it, one irresponsible person jumping on the box-seat and waving a Union Jack over Krüger's head! When the carriage arrived at its destination, Sir Henry, accompanied by Dr. Leyds, entered the hotel, and the President was left sitting in the horseless carriage. The yelling crowd refused to drag the vehicle, and, after some difficulty, a few of his faithful burghers were got together to drag the irate President to his home."

Now, it was for these thousands of Englishmen, who practised this dastardly indignity upon President Krüger, and who, with others, a little later made or promoted the Jameson raid, that Boer naturalization was demanded.

But it has been stated, upon apparently excellent authority, that the British Commission expressly rejected a form of naturalization oath that contained, as our form does, a renunciation of allegiance to all other governments. If, upon the basis of a retained British allegiance, suffrage, whether in local or general affairs, was demanded for the Outlanders, the comic aspect of the situation disappears; the unreason is too great for comedy.

Great Britain cannot, we are told, safely give local government to the Boers when she shall have subjugated them, because she cannot trust their loyalty to the Crown; but she is seeking to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

destroy the republics, because the Transvaal refused suffrage and local control to Englishmen who had attempted by arms to overthrow the Boer Government, and who sought suffrage for the same end. Suffrage was only another form of assault in the interest of British domination.

Not long ago, a distinguished Briton (Goldwin Smith) is reported to have said:

"Can history show a more memorable fight for independence than that which is being made by the Boer? Does it yield to that made by Switzerland against Austria and Burgundy; or to that made by the Tyrolese under Hofer? The Boer gets no pay; no comforts and luxuries are provided for him by fashionable society; he can look forward to no medals or pensions; he voluntarily endures the utmost hardships of war; his discipline, though unforced, seems never to fail. Boys of sixteen, a correspondent at the Cape tells me—even of fourteen—take the rifle from the hand of the mother who remains to pray for them in her lonely home, and stand by their grandsires to face the murderous artillery of modern war. * * * Rude, narrow-minded, fanatical in their religion, these men may be. So were the old Scotch Calvinists; so have been some of the noblest wildstocks of humanity—but surely they are not unworthy to guard a nation. * * * * If a gold mine was found in the Boer's territory, was it not his? The Transvaal franchise needed reform; so did that of England within living memory and in a still greater degree. But reform was not the object of Mr. Cecil Rhodes and his political allies. What they wanted was to give the ballot to people who, they knew, would use it to vote away the independence of the state."

He went on to say that, even in monarchical Italy, where he had recently been, the "heart of the people is with the little republic which is fighting for its independence."

There has been, I think, no suggestion that this great Englishman spoke under the stimulus of Transvaal gold. Have we come to a time when a citizen of the Great Republic may not express like views without becoming a "suspect?" Must we turn our pockets inside out to verify our disinterestedness, when we speak for a "little republic which is fighting for its independence?"

We have not long passed the time when the man who spoke against the "little republic" would have been the "suspect." A paper that I read recently head-lined a news despatch, announcing the return of a young American who went to South Africa to fight for Boer independence, thus: "The Return of a Mercenary." Yet the act and the motive of this adventurous young American would, a little while ago, have reminded us of La Fayette or Steuben.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. James Bryce recently said:

"Indeed the struggles for liberty and nationality are almost beginning to be forgotten by the new generation, which has no such enthusiasm for these principles as men had forty years ago."

And, at the moment when two republics are *in articulo mortis*, some of our journals congratulate us over the prospect of an increased trade with the "Crown Colonies" that are to be set up in their stead, and over the increased output of the Johannesburg mines. The Emperor of Germany is reported to have forestalled President Krüger's personal appeal by the statement that Germany's interest would be promoted by the British conquest of the republics. And Bishop Thoburn asks: "Why should people lament the absorption of the small Powers by the large ones?"

Never before has American sympathy failed, or been divided, or failed to find its voice, when a people were fighting for independence. Can we now calculate commercial gains before the breath of a dying republic has quite failed, or the body has quite taken on the *rigor mortis?* If international justice, government by the people, the parity of the nations, have ceased to be workable things, and have become impracticable, shall we part with them with a sneer, or simulate regret, even if we have lost the power to feel it? May not one be allowed to contemplate the heavens with suppressed aspirations, though there are no "consumers" there? Do we need to make a mock of the stars, because we cannot appropriate them—because they do not take our produce? Have we disabled ourselves?

Mr. Hoar says that "by last winter's terrible blunder * * * we have lost the right to offer our sympathy to the Boer in his wonderful and gallant struggle against terrible odds for the republic in Africa." It is a terrible charge.

There was plainly no call for an armed intervention by the United States in South Africa, and perhaps our diplomatic suggestions went as far as usage would justify. But has not public opinion here been somehow strongly perverted, or put under some unwonted repression? If we have lost either the right to denounce aggression, or the capacity to weep when a republic dies, it is a grievous loss.

BENJAMIN HARRISON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MATILDE SERAO.

BY HENRY JAMES.

FEW attentive readers, I take it, would deny that the English novelist—from whom, in this case, there happens to be even less occasion than usual for distinguishing the American—testifies, in his art, much more than his foreign comrade, from whatever quarter, to the rigor of convention. There are whole sides of life about which he has as little to say as possible, about which he observes, indeed, in general, a silence which, for the foreign comrade, has visibly ended by becoming his great characteristic. He strikes the spectator as having, with a misplaced humility, consented, once for all, to be admonished as to what he shall, or shall not, "mention"—and to be admonished, in especial, by an authority altogether indefinite. He subscribes, when his turn comes round, to an agreement in the drawing-up of which he has had no hand; he sits down to his task, in a word, with a certain received canon of the "proper" before his eyes. The critic I am supposing reproaches him, naturally, in this critic's way, with a marked failure ever to challenge, much less to analyze, that conception; with having never, as would appear, so much as put to himself, in regard to most of the matters of which he makes his mystery, the simple question, "Proper to what?" How can any authority, even the most embodied, asks the exponent of other views, decide for us in advance what shall, in any case, be proper —with the consequent implication of impropriety—to our given subject?

The English novelist would, I imagine, even sometimes be led on to finding that he has practically had to meet such an overhauling by a further admission, though an admission still tacit and showing him as not a little shy of the whole discussion—formulas being, in general, as we know, but little his affair.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Would he not, if off his guard, have been in peril of lapsing into the doctrine—suicidal, when reflected upon—that there may be also an *a priori* rule, a "Thou shalt not," if not a "Thou shalt," as to subjects themselves? Then it would be that his alien foe might fairly revel in the sense of having him in a corner, laughing an evil laugh to hear him plead in explanation that it is exactly *most* as to subjects that he feels the need laid upon him to conform. What is he to do when he has an idea to write about, we might suspect him rashly to inquire, unless, frankly, to ask himself, in the first place of *all*, if it be proper? Not indeed —we catch the reservation—that he is consciously often accessible to ideas for which that virtue may not be claimed. Naturally, however, still, such a plea only brings forth, for his interlocutor, a repetition of the original appeal: "Proper to what?" There is only one propriety the painter of life can ask of a subject: Does it, or does it not, belong to life? So, in simplified terms, at any rate, I seem to hear the interchange; to which I need listen no longer than thus to have derived from it a word of support for my position. The question of our possible rejoinder to outland scorn I must leave for some other connection. The point is—if point I may expect to obtain any countenance to its being called—that, in spite of our great Dickens and, in a minor degree, of our great George Eliot, our eccentricity is, elsewhere than among ourselves, pretty well held to have put us out of court. The thing least conceded to us, moreover, is that we handle at all frankly—if we put forward such a claim—even our own life. "Your own is all we want of you, all we should like to see. But that your system really touches your own is exactly what we deny. Never, never!" For what it really comes to is that, practically, we, of all people in the world, are accused of a system. Call it a conspiracy of silence, and the whole charge is upon us.

The fact of the silence is, fortunately, all that at present concerns us. Did this not happen to be the case, nothing could be more interesting, I think, than to follow somewhat further several of the bearings of the matter, which would bring us face to face, verily, with some wonderful and, I hasten to add, by no means, doubtless, merely disconcerting truths about ourselves. It has been given us to read a good deal, in these latter days, about *l'âme Française* and *l'âme Russe*—and with the result, in all prob-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ability, of our being rather less than more penetrated with the desire, in emulation of these opportunities, to deliver ourselves upon the English or the American soul. There would appear to be nothing we are totally conscious of that we are less eager to reduce to writing, to translate, at all events, into current prose, than either of these objects; and yet, incontestably, there are neighborhoods in which we may feel ourselves within scent and sound of them, by something of the same sense that, in thick forests, serves the hunter of great game. He may not quite see it, but he knows when he is near. So, somehow, we know that we are near when we frankly consider the practice of our race—comparatively recent though it be—in taking for granted the "innocence" of literature.

Our simple way of expressing our conception of this innocence, and our desire for it, is, characteristically enough, by taking refuge in another vagueness, by invoking the allowances that we understand works of imagination and of criticism to make to the "young." I know not whether it has ever officially been stated for us that, given the young, given literature, and given, under stress, the need of sacrificing one or other party, it is not, certainly, by our sense of "style" that our choice would be determined: no great art in the reading of signs and symptoms is, at all events, required for a sense of our probable instinct in such a case. That instinct, in its turn, is far too large a matter to be briefly or easily disposed of, and there would be no greater mistake than to give too simple an account of it. The account most likely to be given by a completely detached critic would be that we are, as a race, better equipped for action than for thought, and that to let the art of expression go by the board is, by that fact, to point to the limits of what we mostly have to express. If we accept such a picture, we shall do so, I think, rather from a strong than from a weak sense of what may easily be made of it; but I glance in that direction only as toward a quarter almost too flooded with light, and come back, after my parenthesis, to what more immediately concerns me: which is the plain reflection that, if the element of compromise—compromise with fifty of the "facts of life"—be the common feature of the novel of English speech, so it is mainly indebted for this character to the less logical of the sexes.

Nothing is, at any rate, *a priori* more natural than to trace a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

connection between our general mildness, as it may most conveniently be called, and the fact that we are likewise so generally feminine. Is the English novel "proper" because it is so largely written by women, or is it, only, so largely written by women because its propriety has been so massively established? The intimate relation is, however, all that is here pertinent; effect and cause may be left to themselves. What is further pertinent, as it happens, is that, on close observation, the relation is not constant; by which I mean that, though the ladies are always productive, the fashion of mildness is not always the same. Convention, in short, has its ups and its downs, and the ladies have, of late years, I think, been as often seen weltering in the hollow of the wave as borne aloft on its crest. Some of them even, incontestably, have been held positively to have distinguished themselves most—whether or no in veils of anonymity—on the occasion of the downward movement; making us really wonder if their number might not fairly, under any permanence of such a movement, be counted on to increase. All sorts of inquiries are suggested, in truth, by the spectacle. "Emancipations" are in the air, and may it not possibly be that we shall see two of the most striking coincide? If convention has, to the tune to which I just invited an ear, blighted our fiction, what shall we say of its admitted, its still more deprecated and, in so many quarters, even deplored, effect upon the great body under the special encouragement of which this fiction has none the less insisted on becoming incomparably copious? Since the general inaptitude of women appears by this time triumphantly to have been proved an assumption particularly hollow, despoiled more and more each day of the last tatters of its credit, why should not the new force thus liberated really, in the connection I indicate, give something of its measure?

It is, at any rate, keeping within bounds to say that the novel will surely not become less free in proportion as the condition of women becomes more easy. It is more or less in deference to their constant concern with it that we have seen it, among ourselves, pick its steps so carefully; but there are indications that the future may reserve us the surprise of having to thank the very class whose supposed sensibilities have most oppressed us for teaching it not only a longer stride, but a healthy indifference to an occasional splash. It is, for instance, only of quite recent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years that the type of fiction known as the "sexual" has created for itself—for purposes of reference, so far as notices in newspapers may be held to constitute reference—an identity variously valued. Now, therefore, though it be early to say that all "imaginative work" from the female hand is subject to this description, there is assuredly none so subject that is *not* from the female hand. The female mind, in fact, in the constant competition, has, on the whole, quite carried off the prize in the familiar game, known to us all from childhood's hour, of trying to be serious—finding thus its opportunity, with no small acuteness, in the more and more marked tendency of the mind of the other gender to revert, alike in the grave and the gay, to extreme simplicities. It is the ladies, in a word, who would lately seem to have done most to remind us of man's relations with himself—that is with woman. His relations with the pistol, the pirate, the police, the wild and the tame beast—are not these, prevailingly, what the gentlemen have given us? And does not the difference sufficiently point my moral?

Let me, however, not appear to have gone too far afield to seek it; for my reflections—general, perhaps, to excess—closely connect themselves with a subject to which they are quite ready to yield in interest. I have lately been giving a happy extension to an old acquaintance, dating from early in the eighties, with the striking romantic work of Matilde Serao; a writer who, apart from other successes, has the excellent effect, the sign of the stronger few, that the end of her story is, for her reader, never the end of her work. On thus recently returning to her, I have found in her something much more to my present purpose than the mere appearance of power and ease. If she is interesting largely because she is, in the light of her free, her extraordinary Neapolitan temperament, a vivid painter and a rich register of sensations and impressions, she is still more so as an exceptionally compact and suggestive *case*, a case exempt from interference and presenting itself with a beautiful unconsciousness. She has had the good—if it be, after all, not the ill—fortune to develop in an air in which convention, in our invidious sense, has had as little to say to her as possible; and she is accordingly a precious example of the possibilities of free exercise. The questions of the proper and the improper are comfortably far from her; and, though, more than in the case of her sisters of English speech,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

she may have to reckon with prescriptions as to form—a burden at which, in truth, she snaps her fingers with an approach to impertinence—she moves in a circle practically void of all prejudgment as to subject and matter. Conscious enough, doubtless, of a literary law to be offended, and caring little in fact, I repeat—for it is her weakness—what wrong it may suffer, she has not even the agreeable incentive of an ability to calculate the "moral" shocks she may administer.

Practically chartered, then, she is further happy—since they both minister to ease—in two substantial facts: she is a daughter of the veritable South and a product of the contemporary newspaper. A Neapolitan by birth and a journalist by circumstance, by marriage and in some degree doubtless also by inclination, she strikes for us, from the first, the note of facility and spontaneity and the note of initiation and practice. Concerned, through her husband, in the conduct of a Neapolitan morning paper, of a large circulation and a radical color, she has, as I infer, produced her novels and tales mainly in such snatches of time and of inspiration as have been left her by urgent day-to-day journalism. They distinctly betray, throughout, the conditions of their birth—so little are they, to the literary sense, children of maturity and leisure. On the question of style, in a foreign writer, it takes a great general intimacy to make us sure of our ground; but I feel myself on the safe side in conceiving that this lady, full of perception and vibration, cannot only not pass for a purist, but must be considered, throughout, in spite of an explosive eloquence, to pretend but little to distinction of form: which, for an Italian, is a much graver predicament than for one of our shapeless selves. That, however, would perhaps pass for a small quarrel with a writer, or rather with a talker and—for it is what one must most insist on—a *feeler,* of Matilde Serao's remarkable spontaneity. Her mere Neapolitanism is a value, to whatever literary lapses it may minister. Truly, it is a rare privilege, to which it may be said that this lady thoroughly "lives up." Loud, loquacious, abundant, natural, happy, with luxurious insistences on the handsome, the costly and the fleshly, the fine persons and fine clothes of her characters, their satin and velvet, their bracelets, rings, white waistcoats, general appointments and bedroom furniture, with almost as many repetitions and as free a tongue, in short, as Juliet's nurse, she reflects at every turn the wonderful mixture

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that surrounds her—the beauty, the misery, the history, the light and noise and dust, the prolonged paganism and the renewed reactions, the great style of the distant and the past, and the generally compromised state of the immediate and the near. These things were all in the germ—they have only, since, gathered volume and assurance—for the reader of her earlier novels; so that I well remember the impression made on me, when the book was new—my copy, apparently of the first edition, bears the date of 1885—by the rare energy, the immense *disinvoltura,* of *"La Conquista di Roma."* This was my introduction to the author, in consequence of which I immediately read *"Fantasia"* and the *"Vita e Avventure di Riccardo Joanna,"* with some smaller pieces; after which, interrupted but not detached, I knew nothing more till, in the course of time, I renewed acquaintance on the ground of *"Il Paese di Cuccagna,"* then, however, no longer in its first freshness. That work set me straightway to reading everything else I could lay hands on, and I think, therefore, that, save *"Il Ventre di Napoli"* and two or three quite recent productions that I have not met, there is nothing from our author that I have not mastered. Such as I find her in everything, she remains above all things the signal "case."

If, however, she appears, as I am bound to note, not to have kept the full promise of her early energy, this is because it has suited her to move less in the direction—where so much might have awaited her—of *"Riccardo Joanna"* and *"La Conquista"* than in that, on the whole less happily symptomatic, of *"Fantasia."* *"Fantasia"* is, before all else, a study of "passion," or rather of the intenser form of that mystery which the Italian *"passione"* better expresses; and I hasten to confess that, had she not so marked herself as an interpreter of this specialty, I should probably not now be writing of her. I conceive, none the less, that it would have been open to her to favor more that side of her great talent of which the so powerful *"Paese di Cuccagna"* is the strongest example. There is, for good luck, in this large, miscellaneous picture of Neapolitan life, no *passione* save that of the observer curiously and pityingly intent upon it, that of the artist resolute, at any cost, to embrace and reproduce it. Admirably, easily, convincingly objective, the thing is a sustained panorama, a chronicle of manners, finding its unity in one recurrent note, that of the consuming lottery-hunger which consti-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tutes the joy, the curse, the obsession and the ruin, according to Matilde Serao, of her fellow-citizens. Her productions divide themselves thus into two rather unequal portions, one of which the critic is tempted to accuse her of having, not altogether happily, sacrificed to the other. When, for the most part, she invokes, under the name of *passione,* the main explanation of the human muddle, she follows the windings of this clue in the upper walks of life, haunts the aristocracy, re-echoes with the nobility, overflows with clothes, jewels and promiscuous intercourse, to the proportionate eclipse of her strong, full vision of common life. *"La Conquista"* is the story of a young deputy who comes up to the Chamber, from the Basilicata, with a touching candor of ambition and a perilous ignorance of the complexity of things. His dream is to conquer Rome, but it is by Rome, naturally, that he is conquered. He alights on his political twig with a flutter of wings, but he has reckoned, in his innocence, without the strong taste, in many quarters, for sport; and it is with a charge of shot in his breast and a drag of his pinions in the dust that he takes his way back to mediocrity, obscurity and the parent nest. It is from the ladies—as was, indeed, even from the first, to be expected with Serao—that he receives his doom; *passione* is, in these pages, already at the door and soon arrives; *passione* rapidly enough passes its sponge over everything not itself.

In *"Cuore Infermo,"* in *"Addio Amore,"* in *"Il Castigo,"* in the two volumes of *"Gli Amanti,"* and in various other places, this effacement is so complete that we see the persons concerned but in the one relation, with every other circumstance, those of concurrent profession, possession, occupation, connection, interest, amusement, kinship, utterly superseded and obscured. Save in the three or four books I have named as exceptional, the figures evoked are, literally, professional lovers, "available," as the term is, for *passione* alone: which is the striking sign, as I shall presently indicate, of the extremity in which her enjoyment of the freedom we so often have to envy has strangely landed her. *"Riccardo Joanna,"* which, like *"La Conquista,"* has force, humor and charm, sounding with freshness the note of general life, is such a picture of certain of the sordid conditions of Italian journalism as, if I may trust my memory without re-perusal, sharply and pathetically imposes itself. I recall *"Fantasia,"* on the other hand, as wholly *passione*—all concentration and erotics, the latter

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

practiced in this instance, as in *"Addio Amore,"* with extreme cruelty to the "good heroine," the person innocent and sacrificed; yet this volume, too, contributes its part, in the retrospect, to that appearance of marked discipleship which was one of the original sources of my interest. Nothing could more have engaged one's attention, in these matters, at that moment, than the fresh phenomenon of a lady-novelist so confessedly flushed with the influence of Emile Zola. Passing among ourselves as a lurid warning even to workers of his own sex, he drew a new grace from the candid homage—all implied and indirect, but, as I re-figure my impression, not the less unmistakable—of that half of humanity which, let alone attempting to follow in his footsteps, was not supposed even to turn his pages. There is an episode in *"Fantasia"*—a scene in which the relations of the hero and the "bad" heroine are strangely consolidated by a visit together to a cattle-show—in which the courage of the pupil has but little to envy the courage of the master. The hot day and hot hour, the heavy air and the strong smells, the great and small beasts, the eloquence—for the sensibilities of the lady and the gentleman—of the rich animal life, the collapse, indeed, of the lady in the presence of the prize bull: all these are touches for which, luckily, our author has the warrant of a greater name. The general picture, in *"Fantasia,"* of the agricultural exhibition at Caserta is, in fact, not the worse at any point for a perceptible echo of more than one French model. Would the author have found so full an occasion in it without a fond memory of the immortal *"Comices"* of *Madame Bovary?*

These, however, are minor questions—pertinent only as connecting themselves with the more solid side of her talent. I delight in such a specimen of it as is offered by the too brief series of episodes of *"The Romance of the Maiden."* These things, dealing mainly with the small miseries of small folk, have a palpable truth, and it is striking that, to put the matter simply, she is at her best almost in direct proportion as her characters are poor. By poor I mean, literally, the reverse of rich; for directly they *are* rich and do, as the phrase is, keep their carriage, her taste totters and lapses, her style approximates at moments to that of the ladies who do the fashions and the letters from the watering-places in the "society" papers. She has, acutely, and she renders it with excellent breadth, the sense of benighted lives, of small,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sordid troubles, of the general unhappy youthful (on the part of her own sex at least), and the general more or less starved plebeian, consciousness. The degree to which it testifies to all this is one of the great beauties of *"Il Paese di Cuccagna"*; though, indeed, the moral of that dire picture be that, in respect to the gaming-passion, the madness of "numbers," no walk of life, at Naples, is too high or too low to be ravaged. Beautiful, in *"Il Romanzo della Fanciulla,"* are the exhibitions of grinding girl-life in the big telegraph office and in the State normal school. The gem of *"Gli Amanti"* is the tiny tale of *"Vicenzella,"* a masterpiece in twenty small pages—the vision of what three or four afternoon hours could contain for a slip of a creature of the Naples waterside, a poor girl who picks up a living by the cookery and sale, on the edge of a parapet, of various rank, dismembered polyps of the southern sea, and who is, from stage to stage, despoiled of the pence she patiently pockets for them by the successive small emissaries of her artful, absent lover, constantly faithless, occupied, not too far off, in regaling a lady of his temporary preference, and proportionately clamorous for fresh remittances. The moment and the picture are but a scrap; yet they are as large as life.

"Canituccia," in *"Piccole Anime,"* may happily pair with *"Vicenzella,"* Canituccia being simply the humble rustic guardian, in field and wood—scarce more than a child—of the still more tender Ciccotto; and Ciccotto being a fine young pink-and-white pig, an animal of endowments that lead, after he has had time to endear himself to his otherwise quite solitary and joyless friend, to his premature conversion into bacon. She assists, helplessly silent, staring, almost idiotic, from a corner of the cabin-yard, by night and lamplight, in the presence of gleaming knives and steaming pots and bloody tubs, at the sacrifice that deprives her of all company, and nothing can exceed the homely truth of the touch that finally rounds off the scene, and for which I must refer my reader to the volume. Let me, further, not fail to register my admiration for the curious cluster of scenes that, in *"Il Romanzo,"* bears the title of *"Nella Lava."* Here frankly, I take it, we have the real principle of "naturalism"—a consistent presentment of the famous "slice of life." The slices given us—slices of shabby, hungry maidenhood in small cockney circles—are but sketchily related to the volcanic catastrophe we hear rumbling

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

behind them, the undertone of all the noise of Naples; but they have the real artistic importance of showing us how little "story" is required to hold us when we get, before the object evoked and in the air created, the impression of the real thing. The thing—interesting inference—has but effectively to *be* real to constitute in itself story enough. There is no story without it, none that is not rank humbug; whereas with it the very desert blooms.

This last-named phenomenon takes place, I fear, but in a minor degree in such of our author's productions as *"Cuore Infermo," "Addio Amore," "Il Castigo"* and the double series of *"Gli Amanti";* and for a reason that I the more promptly indicate, as it not only explains, I think, the comparative inanity of these pictures, but does more than anything else to reward our inquiry. The very first reflection suggested by Serao's novels of "passion" is that they perfectly meet our speculation as to what might, with a little time, become of our own fiction were our particular convention suspended. We see so what, on its actual lines, does, what *has,* become of it, and are so sated with the vision that a little consideration of the latent other chance will surely but refresh us. The effect, then, we discover, of the commission to give *passione* its whole place is that, by the operation of a singular law, no place, speedily, appears to be left for anything else; and the effect of that, in turn, is greatly to modify, first, the truth of things, and second, with small delay, what may be left them of their beauty. We find ourselves wondering after a little whether there may not really be more truth in the world misrepresented according to our own familiar fashion, than in such a world as that of Matilde Serao's exuberant victims of Venus. It is not only that, if Venus herself is notoriously beautiful, her altar, as it happens, is by no means always proportionately august; it is that we draw, in the long run, small comfort from the virtual suppression, by any painter, of whatever skill—and the skill of this particular one fails to rise to the height—of every relation in life but that over which Venus presides. In *"Fior di Passione,"* in *"Addio Amore,"* in *"Il Castigo,"* in *"Gli Amanti,"* the suppression is really complete; the common humanities and sociabilities are wholly absent from the picture.

The effect of this is extraordinarily to falsify the total show, and to present the particular affair—the intimacy in hand for the moment, though the moment be but brief—as taking place in a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strange, false perspective, a denuded desert which experience surely fails ever to give us the like of, and the action of which on the faculty of observation in the painter is anything but favorable. It strikes at the root, in the impression producible and produced, of discrimination and irony, of humor and pathos. The writer before us would, doubtless, contend, on behalf of the works I have mentioned, that pathos, at least, does abound in them—the particular bitterness, the inevitable despair that she again and again shows to be the final savour of the cup of *passione*. It would be quite open to her to urge—and she would be sure to do so with eloquence—that if we pusillanimously pant for a moral, no moral, really, can have the force of her almost inveterate evocation of the absolute ravage of Venus—the desolation that, in nine cases out of ten, Venus may be perceived to leave behind her. That, however, but half meets our argument—which bears by no means merely on the desolation behind, but on the desolation before, beside and, generally, round about. It is not, in short, at all the moral, but the fable itself that, in the exclusively sexual light, is wanting. Love, at Naples and in Rome, as Serao exhibits it, is simply unaccompanied with any reflection of our usual manners—with affection, with duration, with circumstances or consequences, with friends, enemies, husbands, wives, children, parents, interests, occupations, the manifestation of tastes. Who are these people, we presently ask ourselves, who love indeed with fury—though, for the most part, with astonishing brevity—but who are so without any suggested situation in life that they can only strike us as loving for and, more especially, through and in, nothing? We know them by nothing but their convulsions and spasms, and we feel once again that it is not the passion of hero and heroine that gives, that can ever give, the heroine and the hero interest, but that it is they themselves, with the ground they stand on and the air they breathe, who give interest to their passion. This element touches us just in proportion as we see it mixed with other things, with all the things with which it has to reckon and struggle. There is, moreover, another reflection with which pathos, in this connection, has to count, even though it undermine not a little the whole of the tragic effect of the agitations of *passione*. Is the effect most consonant, for the spectator, with truth, really (ruthlessly speaking,) half as tragic as it is something else? Should not the moral be sought in the very

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

different quarter where the muse of comedy, rather, would have the last word? The ambiguity and the difficulty are, it strikes me, of a new growth, and spring from a perverse desire on the part of the erotic novelist to secure for the adventures he depicts a dignity that is not of the essence. To compass this dignity he has to be serious, has to be sad and solemn, and to be, sufficiently, these things, he has, as it strikes us, to be sufficiently false. He has made, in fine, of his erotic a matter of tears and imprecations, and in so doing has rendered a poor service both to pleasure and to pain. Since, by his own free showing, it is pre-eminently a matter of folly, let us at least have folly with her bells, or, when they must—since they must—sound knells and dirges, leave them only to the light hand of the lyric poet, who turns them, at all events, to music. Signora Serao is, in this direction, constantly lugubrious; even in the little so-called pastels of *"Gli Amanti,"* she manages, with an ingenuity worthy of a better cause, to expunge the note of gaiety.

This dismal *parti pris,* indeed, will inevitably, it is to be feared, when all the emancipations shall have said their last word, be that of the ladies. Yet, perhaps, too, whatever such a probability, the tone scarce signifies—in the presence, I mean, of the fundamental mistake from which the author before us warns us off. That mistake, we gather from her warning, would be to encourage, after all, any considerable lowering of the level of our precious fund of reserve. When we come to analyze, we arrive at a final impression of what we pay, as lovers of the novel, for such a chartered state as we have here a glimpse of; and we find it to be an exposure—on the intervention, at least, of such a literary temperament—to a new kind of vulgarity. We have surely already kinds enough. The absence of the convention throws the writer back on tact, taste, delicacy, discretion, subjecting these principles to a strain from which the happy office of its presence is, in a considerable degree and for performers of the mere usual endowment, to relieve him. When we have not a very fine sense, it appears in a manner to have it on our behalf. And how frequent, to-day, in the hurrying herd of brothers and sisters of the pen, *is* a very fine sense? Do we not approach the truth in divining that only an eminent individual, here and there, may be trusted for it? Here—for the case is our very lesson—is this robust and wonderful Serao who is yet not to be trusted at all. Does not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the dim religious light with which we surround its shrine do more, on the whole, for the poetry of *passione* than the flood of flaring gas with which, in her pages, and at her touch, it is drenched? Does it not shrink, as a subject, from such expert recognitions and easy discussions, from so pitiless a reduction to the category of the familiar? It issues from the ordeal with the aspect with which it might escape from a noisy family party or alight from a crowded omnibus. It is at the category of the familiar that vulgarity begins. There may be a cool virtue, therefore, even for "art," and an appreciable distinction, even for truth, in reticences and gaps, in the inspired, inconsistent, indefensible superficial. A feeling revives at last, after a timed intermission, that we may not immediately be quite able, quite assured enough, to name, but which, gradually clearing up, soon defines itself almost as a yearning. We turn round, in obedience to it—unmistakably we turn round again—to the opposite pole, and there, before we know it, we have positively laid a clinging hand on dear old Jane Austen.

HENRY JAMES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BUSINESS SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE.

BY CHARLES R. FLINT.

In considering the business situation in the United States, our foreign commerce is of striking importance. Its bearing on our total business is much greater than its relative volume. As a controlling factor, it has an influence on the general industrial situation similar to that which the surplus reserve held by the Clearing House Banks has on the financial situation. A change in the surplus reserve, although it represents only one-hundredth of one per cent. of the total wealth of the United States, may establish a new rate of interest throughout the country.

The balance of trade between this country and the world represents the "surplus reserve" of the United States. The balance of trade is the difference between our imports and our exports, between what we buy of the world and what we sell. Since the year ending June 30th, 1873, the balance of trade has been in our favor each year, with four exceptions. During the year ending June 30th, 1875, we bought of the world nineteen millions in round numbers more than we sold it. During the year ending June 30th, 1888, the balance of trade against us was twenty-eight millions; during 1889, it was three millions, and during 1893 it was eighteen millions. These years, and the years when the balance of trade in our favor was small, were the years of poor business and hard times. In 1873, when the balance of trade was one hundred and nineteen millions against us, we had the great panic. We were spending abroad more than we were making at home. We were realizing the truth of the homely philosophy of Micawber, who summed up the situation presented by the balance of trade very clearly, when he told David Copperfield: "Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure nineteen six, result

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

happiness. Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure twenty pounds ought and six, result misery."

In the light of Micawber's wisdom, the hopefulness of our present business situation is clearly made manifest, when we see, by the United States Treasury Reports, that for 1900 the balance of trade in our favor is nearly $649,000,000. In other words, we are paying our way as we go, living on the best, spending all the money we want for luxuries as well as necessities, and still "laying by," like the thrifty Yankees we are, at the rate of $54,000,000 a month, $13,000,000 a week, nearly $2,000,000 a day, $80,000 an hour. Every time the minute hand ticks, a "surplus reserve" of $1,300 is posted to Uncle Sam's credit on the books of the world, after he has paid everything he owes in trade.

No wonder Europe is alarmed. No wonder the London *Times* says that it is "a question of paramount interest among all others"; while Paul Leroy Beaulieu, in the *Neues Wiener Tageblatt,* proposes a "European Economical Alliance" against the United States, and alleges that the United States "may henceforth be regarded as the first industrial nation, and their superiority will become strikingly more evident year by year."

Lord Rosebery, one of the keenest observers in the world, and one of the most conservative, gave a very clear idea of the situation in a speech he delivered recently before the Wolverhampton Chamber of Commerce. He said:

"The war I fear is not a military war, * * * the war I regard with apprehension is the war of trade which is unmistakably upon us. I cannot blind my eyes to the fact that so far as we can predict anything of the twentieth century on which we have now entered it is that it will be one of acutest international conflict in point of trade. * * * There are two nations which are obviously our rivals and our opponents in this commercial warfare to come—I do not intend by any means to put others out of that category, but I do say that it is to America and to Germany that we have to look in the future for an acute and increasing competition with regard to our trade. * * * The alertness of the Americans, their incalculable natural resources, their acuteness, their enterprise, their vast population, which will in all probability within the next twenty years reach 100,000,000, will make them very formidable competitors with ourselves."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It certainly will, and he is a bold prophet who will forecast the end, if we only keep our head. Nothing can stop or impede our progress, except the success of such a movement as Mr. Bryan has tried to force on us with his free silver absurdity. But political parties are not fond of suicide, and, having tried free silver twice, the Democracy, I believe, may be safely relied upon not to force this issue again. So our decks are clear, and we can safely steer our course, the controlling factor in the world's commerce.

As for a "European Economical Alliance" to check our growing industrial power in the world, that is the dream of a visionary. Such an alliance, even if it could be formed and maintained, would hurt Europe far more than it would hurt us. The Europeans are too wise and too advanced to immure themselves behind a Chinese wall. Europe needs us much more than we need her. The table of exports and imports shows this very plainly. Last year, Europe bought of us one billion one hundred and eleven million dollars' worth of goods. During the same period, we bought of Europe only four hundred and thirty-nine millions. This gave us against Europe alone a balance of trade amounting to $672,000,000. They bought from us more than two and a half times as much as we bought of them. For every dollar invested by us in European productions, they invested over two dollars and a half in American productions. Ten years ago, in 1890, we exported to Europe only $682,000,000, while we imported $474,000,000. In these few years, therefore, our exports have almost doubled, while our imports have decreased by thirty-five millions.

Striking as they are, as showing the dependence on us that binds Europe, these figures do not tell the whole story. Practically, everything we send across the water is a necessity. Our purchases from Europe, on the other hand, are largely luxuries, things we could do very well without if we care to. We send them one hundred pounds of produce, and they give us in return a few ounces of fizz and feathers. This gives us control of the situation.

A nation's commercial supremacy, as the world is regulated to-day, lies in its manufactures. It is here we are strong; for our exports of manufactured products have grown by leaps and bounds, and are forging ahead at a rate that must appall the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

European student of industrial economics. During the past two years, our exports of manufactured goods have been forty per cent. more than during the previous two years. During the past four years, our balance of trade in manufactures has amounted to more than it did during the entire existence of the Republic before that period.

For the ten months ending October 31st, 1900, we imported $71,786,358 worth of articles "wholly or partially manufactured for use as materials in the manufactures and mechanics arts," and $111,736,745 worth "manufactured ready for consumption," a total of $183,523,103. Our exports of manufactures for the same period amounted to $376,247,618, leaving a balance of trade in our favor of $192,724,515 for manufactures alone. It is difficult to add to the force of these figures. They mean that, for every dollar's worth of goods imported by us and produced by the cheap labor of the world, we are selling to these cheap laborers themselves two dollars' worth. And this state of affairs has existed less than four years; it has grown up during a time when the general increase of wages in America has been greater than ever before in our history, with the exception of the period of our Civil War, when the scarcity of men outside the two armies was so great that wages in peace pursuits were abnormally stimulated. Europe is awaking to a realization of what is happening to her. The Hamburg *Fremdenblatt,* in a recent editorial that has attracted national attention, declares that:

"The Union is marching with gigantic strides toward conversion from an agricultural to an industrial nation. The steel manufactures of the United States, which two decades ago were in their infancy, to-day control the markets of the world, dictate either directly or indirectly the prices of iron and steel in all countries, and, partly through the richness of their supply of iron ores and coal, partly by the use of labor-saving machinery and skilful, effective means of transportation, have attained a position to not only compete with the older iron and steel producing countries, but even to profitably export their products to England."

After pointing out that American tools, American shoes, American sewing-machines, bicycles and agricultural implements, American stoves and everything else American, are driving European goods out of the foreign markets, the *Fremdenblatt* points out that Europe is no longer able to compete with our manufactures in her own great centres, adding:

"Incidentally, it may be remarked that the typewriting machine

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with which this article is written, as well as the thousands—nay, hundreds of thousands—of others that are in use throughout the world, was made in America, that it stands on an American table, in an office furnished with American desks, bookcases and chairs, which cannot be made in Europe of equal quality, so practical and convenient, for a similar price."

What has brought about this wonderful change in so short a period, a change without precedent on earth?

Our great natural resources, our intelligent and industrious people, working under the most modern methods, availing themselves of the highest development of labor-saving machinery, a development made possible through centralized manufacturing. And these conditions are going to make the change even more pronounced next year, and the year thereafter, than it has been in the past two years. We are living in an age of industrial evolution, and here in the United States the most perfect results of this evolution have been attained.

The system of centralized manufacture, that has found so firm a place with us, permits for numerous reasons the highest perfection of special machinery and processes. The factory running on full time, on large volume, reduces the percentage of working charges. Direct sales on a large scale minimize the cost of handling. There is an improved system of distribution which reduces aggregate stocks, and thereby saves shop-wear, storage, insurance and interest. Consolidated management results in fixing the standards of quality, the best standards being adopted; in avoiding waste and financial embarrassment through overproduction; in minimizing loss by bad debts through comparisons of credit, and in securing the advantages of comparative accounting and comparative administration. We are to-day shipping manufactured goods to countries where the rate of wages averages forty per cent. less than our wage-earners are receiving. The European wage-earner, instead of welcoming labor-saving machinery, as our workmen have done, has persistently tried to retard its general use; and the result has been that wages have been lower in Europe. The American workman has received more because he has produced more, and this is the great reason why, notwithstanding our high wages, we are so rapidly extending our trade with foreign markets.

In view of the fact that the maintenance of high wages in the United States is largely dependent upon our increasing ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ports, the question is often asked, whether we could maintain them in competition with the cheap labor of China, were China to become a manufacturing country. The best answer is that, in 1899, among our other exports, we shipped two hundred million yards of cotton cloth to the Chinese. The average rate of wages paid by us in its manufacture was seven times the average rate of wages prevailing in China.

It is not, however, in the Chinese markets nor in comparison with China that the most instructive and satisfactory facts are to be ascertained. It is rather in comparison with our most important competitor, the United Kingdom. Heretofore, the United Kingdom has held first place as an exporting nation. In 1875, the exports of the United Kingdom were twice as much as our own. In figures, our exports amounted to $513,442,711, while the exports of the United Kingdom were $1,029,897,310. Our exports from that year until 1896, when we took our position definitely as a manufacturing nation, fluctuated enormously. The volume depended entirely upon our crops. In 1892, it ran up to one billion, only to drop again the next year to eight hundred and forty-seven millions. The election in 1896 stimulated our manufactures enormously. We jumped from eight hundred and eighty-two millions in 1896 to one billion and fifty millions in 1897. In 1898, we passed the Englishmen for the first time in our history and theirs, as an exporting nation. In 1899, they regained their lead, their exports exceeding ours by a few millions. But for the year just closed we are again in advance, this time by the substantial sum of ten millions, and at the rate at which we are progressing, we will probably lead the United Kingdom for 1901 by four or five times ten million dollars. These figures show that we are, indeed, the leading nation of the world. But even they tell the story only in part, for we are not only the leading exporting nation, but the only nation in the world that shows any considerable trade balance on the right side. The United Kingdom, for ten months in 1900, imported $2,081,000,000 worth of merchandise against exportations amounting to $1,183,000,000, leaving a trade balance against her of $897,539,819. Germany, which ranks next among the industrial nations, imported $952,-919,000 for nine months in 1900, and exported merchandise valued at $714,060,000, leaving a trade balance against her for nine months of $237,959,000. France for nine months imported

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

$638,996,000 and exported $580,471,000, a difference of $58,525,000 against her.

While, therefore, the United States is piling up a credit balance of over $600,000,000 a year, our three chief competitors for the trade of the world are writing a total of over one billion on the wrong side of the ledger. That the full significance of these may be appreciated, they must be studied and analyzed. It is as though four houses were doing business side by side; one of these houses—the United States—after paying all its running expenses, has a balance in the bank of six hundred millions in round numbers; while the other three houses have an aggregate loss to write up at the end of each year amounting to one thousand million dollars. This condition is all the more remarkable, in view of the fact that the domination of the United States really began only in 1897, when the trade balance in our favor jumped from $102,882,264 for 1896 to $286,263,144 in 1897. The next year, 1898, the increase was even more amazing, for, on June 30th, 1898, we showed a favorable trade balance of $615,432,676. In other words, in twelve months we trebled our credits on the world's books.

And now we are forging ahead at a rate that promises to make all records small by comparison. For the last quarter of 1900, the trade balance in our favor was two hundred and forty-one million dollars. If this rate is maintained through 1901, as the indications promise, our balance of trade will amount to more than the entire exports of Germany for a year.

As if this were not sufficient, we have also become the chief gold-producing country of the world. Our output of the yellow metal for 1900 was over a million and a half a week. The Director of the United States Mint estimates that we have made a considerable gain over 1899, when we produced seventy-one millions of gold. Australasia in 1899 produced seventy-nine millions, and Africa seventy-three millions. Australasia remained stationary and the United States and Canada gained in round numbers twelve millions. The final figures may show that Australasia leads us slightly for 1900; but, if such is the case, the difference will be so small as practically to give us first place, in view of the fact that our increase was pronounced in the past year, while Australasia stood still. It is reasonable, therefore, to expect that, in the year to come, we shall take the first rank among the gold-producing nations of the earth by a pronounced margin.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Figures are ordinarily not sensational, but certainly such figures as these must be more startling to the average citizen than whole reams of flaming headlines in the newspapers. They show, as nothing else in the world shows, that the Yankee stands so high that the citizen of no other nationality is in the same class with him.

It is this state of affairs that has reversed the old order of things; that has made us lenders instead of borrowers of money, has changed us from a debtor to a creditor nation. For the first time in our history, we have taken up the loans of other governments instead of offering ours to them. England, Russia, Germany, Sweden and Mexico have all in turn been accommodated in the last two years. These facts, together with the fact that our currency has been established on a stable basis, have put the business of the United States on a footing of soundness such as it has never known before. The people of enterprise and ability, feeling assured of the stability of our financial condition, are everywhere doing a great amount of construction work. Business is developing with us in every direction, and there is every reason to believe that it will continue to develop for a long time to come. Twenty-five years ago, if such conditions had prevailed as prevail to-day in London financial circles, and as prevailed in Africa when the mines were shut down by the war, there would have been a panic in the United States, caused by a withdrawal of funds by foreign holders of securities. The Englishman and the German and the Frenchman would have called for their money, and returned to us our stocks and bonds. But so distinctly have we progressed that we have been unaffected by the foreign conditions. In fact, the period of our greatest prosperity has been since these conditions have prevailed on the other side.

It was one of the peculiarities of our prosperous eras in years past that the balance of trade in our favor was generally reduced when we were making money fastest. This was due to the fact that, when times became prosperous, we were treating ourselves to luxuries on an increased scale, and sending our produce to Europe in return for them. Now we are manufacturing many of our own luxuries, supplying the domestic market and sending them into neutral foreign markets as well.

If, at the very outset of our career as a great manufacturing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nation, this satisfactory state of affairs prevails, what may we expect of the future, in view of the fact that our resources have hardly been tapped? Our great forests, our inexhaustible deposits of metal and coal, assure us an expanding greatness under our growing system of centralized manufacture and economic production. The balance of trade in our favor will increase steadily, and only one factor prevents our dominating the rest of the world so thoroughly as to take from England immediately the position of the financial centre of the world. This factor is that England has such prodigious investments in the United States that her people are reaping with us the advantage of our prosperity. The English, and the other foreigners who brought their money to us to invest in our railroads, in our factories, and in our enterprises generally, are drawing substantial dividends; and this, in a measure, restores the balance which otherwise would overwhelm Europe. They are partners with us to the extent of their investments in our prosperity, and our favored commercial condition. The English, for instance, are our largest underwriters in the insurance field. I once pointed out to Mr. Blaine that, if the war-clause was removed from our fire policies, England would be the greatest sufferer were New York to be bombarded. It is this interweaving of interests, and the fact that we are paying about one hundred millions a year for ocean freight to foreign ships, and sending about one hundred millions a year abroad with our American tourists, that alone preserves England's status as the financial centre of the world. She gets from these sources, in a measure, what she loses in the balance of trade.

Of course, the era of prosperity with which we are now blessed will not continue in its present form forever. History will repeat itself, and periods of contraction will come again. There always have been cycles of contraction and expansion in peace, and these cycles will continue to recur. There are periods of expansion when the mills are running full, and there are periods of contraction when the number of unemployed is large. Confidence is at the foundation of expanding business activity. The amount of business transacted on credit is over two thousand times that transacted in exchange for gold or silver. If there is confidence, the manufacturer employs many hands, the laborers purchase more, the retailers send more orders, the jobber orders more from the manufacturer, the manufacturer employs more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hands, and all who want work can find it. This produces the condition that brings prosperity.

Contraction is caused by lack of confidence. Then the manufacturer is afraid to produce goods. He discharges some of his employees, and they in turn must purchase less. This affects the retailer, who cancels his orders with the jobber. In turn, the manufacturer must still further reduce his output and his pay-roll. Hard times result.

These processes are as inevitable as the rising and setting of the sun; but whereas in the past the United States was among the first to be affected by these cycles of contraction, she will in the future be among the last to be affected. This means that the good times we are now enjoying will last longer than any period of prosperity heretofore known in America. It cannot fail to be otherwise with the great balance of trade in our favor, with our great accumulated wealth, and with the rapidly growing development of our vast resources. Long after all the other nations are in the throes of hard times, prosperity will continue here. This is so well understood abroad that the foreigners are everywhere eager seekers for our securities. Since the last election, there has been a rush for American investments unparalleled in history. Both the New York and London Stock Exchanges have broken all records in the sales of our stocks and bonds. All over the world, capital is anxious to go into partnership with American industrial enterprises. The foreigners feel, as we do, that, after years of agitation, the stability of our currency has been finally established.

Heretofore, we have always been more or less erratic in the matter of currency. Our promises to pay have been so little prized that, at the first sign of trouble at home or abroad, immense quantities of our securities held by foreigners were flung upon the market, and the shipments of money demanded drained our financial resources. It was this fact that hurt us so seriously in November, 1890, when the Baring embarrassment occurred in London. Situated as we are to-day, such an occurrence would have little or no effect upon us. In fact, the failure of investments in such countries as the Argentine Republic, Peru and elsewhere, would simply help to emphasize the soundness of our securities.

Few people realize how far back the spectre of silver coinage served to unsettle conditions and values here. So thorough an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American as Samuel J. Tilden shipped a million and a half of gold to London in 1884, for fear of the passage of a free coinage act. From that time until the passage of the Currency Act, we have, at different times, gone on a series of financial debauches. These resulted in the panic of 1893 and the era of depression in 1894, 1895 and 1896, culminating in Bryan's free-silver plank, which demoralized everything. After the election of 1896, confidence increased and continued to grow so steadily that the reopening of the old question last year had comparatively little effect. People felt so assured of the triumph of sound money that, despite the uncertainty that always lurks in national elections, they were on the whole willing to risk investment. Now that we are free from the silver nightmare, the only stumbling block that remained in the way of our progress is removed. The banker and the merchant are relieved from the condition of suspense. They know that the foundation of trade is firm and solid. They no longer dread that the dollar, which is the medium of trade, will be changed over night to fifty cents. Naturally, they are prepared to take advantage of every trade opening, and to invest liberally in the great fields of industry.

It is our great good fortune that our prosperity is built on lines that place us beyond the competition of the world, thanks to the fact that our mechanical processes are so highly developed. We have cheaper steel, cheaper coal and cheaper lumber than any other nation. With our modern machinery, we are constantly going into virgin fields, and in an incredibly short time are building up industries that only a few years ago were impossible. Only recently, a business combination was effected for the production of lumber in South Carolina, as a result of which over one hundred and fifty million feet a year are being sent out of the great saw-mills in that State, where formerly the production was unimportant. I know no better illustration of the far-reaching control of our mechanical perfection than the fact that we are to-day shipping lumber from this country to South America, transporting it to the seaport by rail, reloading on vessels and carrying it through one thousand miles of forest along the Amazon, to lay it down finally in an interior town of Brazil cheaper than it can be manufactured at the very doors of this town by the crude processes employed there.

I have laid great stress on the importance of our foreign

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trade; but to reach an adequate understanding of our true situation, attention must be given to the condition of our domestic trade.

Our interstate commerce to-day is the largest trade carried on anywhere in the world under conditions of absolute free trade. Therefore, even if Europe were in a position to form an "Economical Alliance" against the United States, our mills and factories would still be kept busy supplying the needs of our own people.

And we are also being called on, more extensively each day, to supply the needs of that vast region on the other side of the Pacific which has just been opened up to our trade. China, Japan, Corea, Asiatic Russia, are fields for our enterprise on a scale until recently undreamed of. China alone has 400,000,000 people—more than the whole of Europe. The same conditions that have made us supreme in trade across the Atlantic will give us control across the Pacific. We will overcome both European and Asiatic competition, thanks to our mechanical genius.

It is my firm belief that the time is not far distant when our commerce across the Pacific will be as heavy as it is to-day across the Atlantic. This condition will be enormously facilitated by the construction of an Isthmian Canal.

A promise of what the future has in store for us in this direction has already begun to manifest itself. In less than seven years, our trade with the East has been trebled. In 1893, we sold China, Japan and the other countries comprising Asia and Oceanica, thirty million dollars' worth of goods. In 1899, we sold them ninety-one millions' worth. As soon as China is pacified and normal conditions are restored there and elsewhere in the East, our trade will progress at a rate that will make even this startling increase seem insignificant. A factor that will help us materially in the development of this trade is the trans-Siberian railroad. With the completion of that road, there will be open to us a vast new territory, to which we will have access under conditions that favor us in every respect. For all practical purposes, this railroad is a continuation of our transcontinental lines, the Pacific steamers serving as ferries. We will be nearer the markets through which this route runs than any country of Europe. The country traversed by the trans-Siberian road is purely agricultural. Its manufactures, like the manufactures of Russia herself, are unimportant. Already, we have supplied

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russia with most of the material used in building the railroad; and, as the country settles up, and the demands of the people for manufactured goods grow, they must look to us to supply them. From 1898 to 1900, our exports to Asiatic Russia were practically doubled. During the same period, our exports to Japan, the other Asiatic country where development is being rapidly pushed, also increased enormously, growing from sixteen millions for the ten months ending October 31st, 1898, to twenty-three millions for the same period in 1900.

The whole world is adding to our wealth, and here in America all the people are sharing in the prosperity that has come. Any one who doubts this, and who pays heed to the oft-repeated outcry against the centralization of wealth, need only study the statistics of the savings banks. In New York State, the people have deposited in the savings banks over one billion dollars, a growth in two and a half years of two hundred and fifty millions, in round numbers. These deposits are earning for their owners more than thirty million dollars a year. There were, in round numbers, over two hundred thousand depositors who had accounts with savings banks. Their average deposits were $452.89. Great Britain's average was only $96.57, Prussia's average was $155.91, while Austria-Hungary, which ranks next to the United States, averaged but $220.47 to each depositor.

Surely the American people have cause to be satisfied.

CHARLES R. FLINT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROTESTANT FOREIGN MISSIONS; A RETROSPECT OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BY THE REV. JUDSON SMITH, D. D., CORRESPONDING SECRETARY OF THE AMERICAN BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS.

THE nineteenth century has gone into history with an imperishable name and glory. During its progress, our knowledge of the world and of the people who live in it has been vastly expanded. The whole domain of physical science, if it has not been discovered, has certainly been explored and mapped out in the most comprehensive way. Inventions, and those of the greatest importance, have multiplied beyond all precedent. Steam and electricity have been applied to human needs in manifold forms, have revolutionized modes of travel and have brought the ends of the world together. Solid gains have been made in the possession of civil and religious liberty; the leading nations are coming to a mutual understanding and combining in a league for perpetual peace. Time would fail to tell of the gains in Education, Literature, the Arts and Social Forces, which enrich life and enhance personal power. But if the nineteenth century is the *saeculum mirabile* in these respects, it is quite as much so in the development of the Foreign Missionary enterprise. There are but two other periods in the history of Christianity that can compare with it in this respect—the first three centuries, including the Apostolic Age, and the three centuries at the opening of the Middle Ages. In the former, the Church was founded, the nations taught and the Roman Empire Christianized; in the latter, the peoples of central and northern Europe were converted and brought into the circle of Latin Christendom. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, there were a few societies, scantily manned and equipped, prosecuting their work far apart, not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without spirit and promise, but with very meager results. At the end of the century, we see an enterprise of wide reach, conscious of itself, experienced, wisely drilled and led, attempting great things and winning splendid victories. It is like the Parliamentary army in the Puritan Revolution, at first not without merit, of high purpose, but not united, not effective, which at last became the Ironsides that won at Naseby and Dunbar and Worcester, sweeping everything before it, entering no battle but to conquer.

The Modern Era of Protestant Foreign Missions set in decisively with William Carey and the formation in 1792 of the English Baptist Missionary Society under his leadership. The London Missionary Society, in which many Dissenting Churches united, followed in 1795; a Scotch Society, and one in the Netherlands, in 1797; the Church Missionary Society, within the Anglican Church, in 1799. One fact should be premised. As there were heroes before Agamemnon, so there were Protestant missions before Carey's time; and foreign missionary work had been done on this side of the sea before the days of Mills and Judson and Hall. In some proper sense, the discovery of this western world was in the interest of the wider spread of the gospel; Columbus sought to enlarge the jurisdiction and blessings of the Roman Church. Plymouth Colony was designed to gain a free field for the reformed faith and a foothold whence to spread the gospel into new parts of the world. John Eliot's work among the Indians to the west of Roxbury from 1646 was a fine instance of foreign missionary enterprise; and it was only one among many. The Mayhews and Sargents wrought on the same plan. The great work of the Moravians from 1732, in Southern Africa, in Labrador, in the West Indies, is a noble instance of pioneer effort in hard places.

Let us take a brief survey of the state of Foreign Missions one hundred years ago. Carey is just beginning his wonderful work as translator at Serampore; the first laborers of the London Missionary Society are enduring the "night of toil" on Tahiti before any fruit appears; the Moravians are bearing the Word to darkened souls in remote parts of the Eastern and Western hemispheres. The churches are scarcely awake to the call, or to their privilege in responding to it; the enterprise is known by few and believed in by fewer still. There are few converts on foreign soil, here and there a feeble band; no schools for training native

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

laborers; the Bible speaks as yet in few vernaculars. Goodly beginnings have been made, the church is awakening, and all is hopeful; but it is the gray dawn of the day, and it is faith only that can take in the greater things that are at hand. Scarcely a dozen missionary societies, all in Great Britain and Germany, a few scores of missionaries scattered through many lands, a handful of converts and pupils, a total expenditure of a few thousands a year—this is the scene which presents itself at the opening of the century. From this point the growth has been slow, but continuous and accelerating through the successive decades; until we reach the facts with which all are familiar to-day.

The expansion of the fields occupied by foreign missions is one of the most striking facts of the century. Where Carey stood alone at its opening, more than two thousand missionaries, representing fifty different Societies, now occupy nearly every strategic point in the vast peninsula of India and in Ceylon. And Burma and Siam and China and Japan, not even explored as missionary ground at that time, are studded with mission stations and teem with a vast volume of missionary labors. Africa was then touched only by the Moravians in a few points; to-day thousands of missionaries, from nearly fifty Societies, are at work around all its vast seaboard, and among many tribes in the interior, then wholly unexplored. The pioneers of the London Missionary Society had just arrived among the islands of the Pacific, where now well nigh every group has its missionaries, and not a few have become active centers of a wider Christian propagandism. And, in short, there is scarcely a country, or tribe, or island on the earth where missionaries are not at work, and where the Christian church does not already exert its uplifting influence. There is no recorded march of military conquest that is more resistless, significant or inspiring, than this steady expansion of the foreign missionary enterprise.

The most reliable statistics enumerate 449 different Protestant Foreign Missionary organizations to-day, 249 of them directly devoted to missionary work, 92 indirectly co-operating in such work, and 102 engaged in special lines of work. There is scarcely a Protestant denomination that does not have its Society, its field, and its laborers. This is a new and significant fact in Christian history. For the few scores of missionaries at work in 1800, at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the close of the century we have 13,607, with an army of 73,615 native helpers by their side, distributed in over five thousand central stations through all the unevangelized peoples of the earth. In this single fact we have the promise of final victory. In these fields are 10,993 organized churches, with a membership of 1,289,289 souls, increasing at the rate of 83,895 each year. The annual income of the major Societies has reached the noble sum of $17,161,092, and the yearly gifts from native Christians aggregate $1,833,981. The educational work presents like noble proportions. There are 93 colleges on mission fields, with 35,414 students, of whom 2,275 are women: of theological and training schools 385 are reported, with 11,905 students. Boarding and high schools number 857 and 83,148 pupils; industrial and medical classes count 197, and enroll 6,998 pupils; while in common or day schools the pupils reach the number of 904,442. The grand total of those under instruction is 1,046,309, one-third of them girls. The Bible, entire or in portions, has been translated into 421 different languages or dialects; a work of incalculable labor and value, of itself alone sufficient to challenge for this great enterprise the profound respect of the civilized world. Add to this the products of mission presses—364,904,399 pages of Christian literature annually, and 297,435 copies of periodical literature—and the significance of this fact becomes majestic in proportions and influence. Besides all this, bear in mind the 355 hospitals and 753 dispensaries, with 2,579,650 patients treated every year, to every one of whom the gospel is preached, many hearing it for the first time; and the Foreign Missionary enterprise that includes all these varied agencies assumes the dimensions and character of the greatest single force for the uplifting and regeneration of the world which we know or of which we can conceive. All this is the achievement of the century which lies behind us, and is a just index, but by no means the full proof, of the progress of missions in this period. And when we consider that the rate of advance has been accelerating with every decade, that this century has been marked by pioneer work, and that now the forces that co-operate here are working at their best, who can measure the significance of the animating scene that rises before us in the new century, or fail to exult in the nearing prospect of Christ's universal sway among the nations of the earth!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is instructive to note the great names that mark these decades, and lift the service they represent above all petty criticism and thoughtless ridicule. Among them are such as Carey, Marshman, Duff, Hall and Ballantine in India; Judson and Vinton in Burma; Moffatt, Livingstone and Lindley in Africa; Dwight, Hamlin and Riggs in Turkey; Morrison, Bridgman and Parker in China; Pattison, Williams, Bingham and Gulick in the Pacific Islands. And what shall we say more of Ashmore and Griffith, John and Blodget, of Davis and Verbeck and Hepburn, of Chamberlain and Clough, of Logan and Paton, who through faith have "subdued Kingdoms, wrought righteousness and obtained a good report."

There are many particular facts included in this general description of progress, which may well detain our thoughts for a time. Note first the growing enlistment of the church in this great work. How difficult Carey found it to draw the Baptist churches of England into the effort of supporting a mission in India! Recall the indifference which the London Missionary Society had to encounter, the animosity which missionary proposals evoked in Scotland, the opposition which the chartering of the American Board called out. But, little by little, the atmosphere changed, the trickling streams became rills, and rills deepened and multiplied and formed brooks and rivers; till now the winter is vanished and it is springtime everywhere. It is no longer good form for any Protestant church, or for any Protestant church members, to have no share in mission work. The Woman's Boards, which began their work only thirty years ago and now number 120, with an annual income of $2,500,000, are both cause and effect of the widening hold of this enterprise; the Student Volunteer Movement, with an organization which reaches thousands of Colleges and Seminaries and belts the globe, with its grand apparatus for the study of missions and the awakening of enthusiasm for missionary work, is a noble proof of its deepening sway in all the schools for higher education. And, though we are still far from what is ideal in condition, the progress is so prodigious as to call for the deepest gratitude.

The dimensions and influence of the native agency in the field constitute another fact of peculiar significance and glorious hope. It is all the product of the nineteenth century; and no part of mission work is of greater value. Every native pastor becomes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an apostle to his own people, and does more to make the gospel permanent in the land than any missionary can do. Multiply them sufficiently, and the missionary is needed no longer; they themselves become the leaders and bulwark of the native church. It is by them that every land is to be evangelized. And the fact that to-day 73,000 native helpers are co-operating with the 13,000 foreign laborers, that there are as many native pastors as there are ordained men from all Christian lands, is a noble proof how far the work has advanced, a glorious promise that it is presently to be complete.

A notable evidence of the progress which Missions have made is found in the character and deeds of the native Christian communities in many lands. This is a demonstration beyond all question or cavil. Instances may be brought from many fields; I mention but three.

After a period of remarkable growth, the Christians of Madagascar were subjected to the fiercest of persecutions under the wicked Ranalavona through a series of years, with their foreign leaders all expelled from the Island. They perished by the score and by the hundred, till they wearied out their persecutors, but kept their faith and enriched the martyr hosts of the Christian church.

When missionaries went to the Fiji Islands, in 1835, the people were heathen and cannibals, the terror of their neighbors and of all mariners. After a period of fifty years, cannibalism had ceased; all idols had vanished; Christianity was in possession of the islands; as many people, in proportion to the population, attended church there as in Massachusetts; and their gifts for religious purposes ranked with the most generous in the world.

Until very recently China has been deemed one of the most difficult of missionary fields, the converts being few and progress slow. Morrison began in 1808; in 1840 there were but six converts; in 1860 they hardly reached a thousand. To-day they exceed a hundred thousand, and, until the recent anti-foreign disturbance broke out, they were doubling in less than ten years. And now their character has been tested in the fierce flame of persecution; hundreds and thousands, for their faith, "have not loved their lives to the death." And the Chinese church is the martyr church, Christian faith and love casting a celestial radiance upon the horrors that have filled the land. By the side of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Polycarp, Ignatius, Cyprian, whom we sing and praise forevermore, stand now these Chinese believers who have renewed the deeds and heroism of those early martyrs before our very eyes. And in a thousand homes in many climes, the virtues that bespeak Christ's transforming power even more clearly than a martyr's death, blossom in beauty and fill the land with a glorious light.

When the century opened, the great religions of the East seemed to stand untouched and strong, firm in their hold upon the people, stout in the opposition they offered to the entrance of a new faith. This was one of the serious obstacles which missions had to encounter as each new field was entered. Many things, doubtless, have contributed to the change which we witness: the extension of commerce; the wider reach of England's influence; the internal decay of the old faiths; the demonstrated power of Christianity to give comfort, courage, an aggressive spirit, a noble style of life and thought. To-day, these religions have ceased to be formidable opponents of the Christian faith. Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, are but the shadows of their former strength, and seem on the point of extinction. In nothing have we a surer proof of the progress of missions, the resistless growth of the Kingdom of Christ. What Milton saw, in poetic vision, of the power of Christ in the presence of the ancient faiths, is becoming reality:

> "The oracles are dumb;
> No voice or hideous hum
> Runs through the arched roof in words deceiving;
> Apollo from his shrine
> Can no more divine,
> With hollow shriek the steep of Delphos leaving."

The message of the missionary has not changed; indeed, it cannot change until the errand of Christianity in the earth is finished. Differences of methods there have been; variations in the place of emphasis may be noted; diversities of gifts will always exist. But the vital message of the missionary is the same to-day as that of St. Paul in Macedonia and Athens, the same as when Carey and Judson began; the same in China and Japan as it is in India and Africa. Its great theme is the living God, Maker of heaven and earth, revealed in Jesus Christ for the redemption of man, speaking to the conscience and heart of man through his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

written word, and supremely by the Holy Spirit, and opening the Kingdom of heaven with peace on earth and a glorious immortality to all believers. The missionary proclaims the God of love and salvation, and opens the door of hope to all the children of men. This message can never change, while sin exists and human nature remains the same. It is redemption that men need, it is redemption that Christ brings, it is redemption that the missionary preaches wherever he goes. This is his single theme, his ample message, his persuasive story. All else may change; tongues may cease, knowledge may vanish away; but this remains the supreme word of life to a hopeless world. Civilized nations, refined peoples, these later days, need it, wait for it, will perish without it, as truly as barbarous nations and savage peoples and the ancient days.

The century has been a period of beginnings, of pioneer work in many lines. It is not reasonable to demand completed results. Much time has necessarily been given to exploration, to the discovery of lands and peoples and opportunities for work. This has already been carried so far that it is a simple statement of fact to say that the unevangelized world is fully opened and accessible to missionary labor. It is the first time in the history of the world when this could be truthfully said. This work will not need to be repeated. The mastery of the vernaculars of the people among whom the work is to be done, was an imperative prerequisite to the success of the enterprise. In many cases, the languages had never been reduced to written form, and this was the first duty awaiting the missionary. To-day, this herculean task is far advanced toward completion, and the fruits of this vast labor are the inheritance of the new century.

Like permanent foundations have been laid in many other ways. The good will of the people has been won; schools have been organized and are in successful operation; churches have been gathered and are in training under native pastors for an increasing share in the work; the Bible, wholly or in parts, has been translated into hundreds of languages or dialects, and is accessible to the vast majority of the unevangelized peoples of the earth; text books for schools and a Christian literature are provided in large measure, to aid in the development of the Christian body. These things will not need to be done again, but they stand ready for continued and more effective use—the splen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

did apparatus of a vigorous and world-wide campaign. There is in many lands a strong, well-trained and experienced body of missionaries, surrounded and aided by seven times their own number of native helpers, prepared to take advantage of all these vast facilities, and push the work of Christianizing the world in the most energetic and effective way. We have already observed a constant acceleration in the rate of increase in the positive results of mission work; and we have every reason to expect that this rate of increase will steadily rise throughout the coming century. Probably, in no respect is the progress of this work during the nineteenth century more marked or significant than in the accomplishment of all this vast preliminary and pioneer work. It took three years to marshal and train the armies of the Union; but when that had been done, it required but another year to bring the war to a victorious end. But the progress in those years of preparation was as real and significant as in that one year of resistless advance.

But even the nineteenth century has recorded signal successes, foretastes of the final victory. Witness the conversion of Tahiti, of the Society Islands, of Samoa, of the Friendly Islands, of the New Hebrides, of the Sandwich Islands and so many other islands of the Pacific. Recall, also, the inspiring progress in Madagascar and Uganda, among the Telugus and the Karens, in Japan and in the older missions in China. Enough has been achieved to prove the possibility of universal success. It is no experiment in which we are engaged; it is a supremely successful work. There are no backward steps in Christ's march down the centuries and across the nations to universal victory. This imposing work, with its impregnable foundations, its powerful and growing array, is beyond the reach of cavil or sneer, is confessedly the one resistless, triumphant force in the enlightenment of the nations and in the uplifting of the world. We do not now celebrate the triumph, but we are on the march; every foe flees before us, every year makes the cause more resistless; and the end is both certain and near at hand.

JUDSON SMITH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE INDEPENDENCE OF CUBA.

BY FRANK D. PAVEY.

By the joint resolution demanding the withdrawal of Spain from Cuba, Congress declared that the people of Cuba were free and independent; disclaimed any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over the island, except for its pacification; and asserted the determination of the United States, when that was accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

On January 1st, 1899, the United States began its military occupation of Cuba. As early as January 1st, 1900, the opinion became widespread in Cuba that the United States would never withdraw from the island. This opinion was based upon the observation of facts. It was founded upon the rule that actions speak louder than words. The American military government had extended its active interference into every branch of civil administration, judicial, legislative and executive. The judicial system was altered, and the personnel of the judiciary changed, as often as suited the whims of the military governor. Old laws were modified, and new ones promulgated, by military order, and made to conform to the plans and purposes of the military government. The sphere of executive functions had no limits. The administrative plans were made upon a scale which no temporary government could execute. The facts all pointed to a deliberate and mature intention of permanent occupation.

There was no official utterance which could be cited as the basis or justification of an opinion that the United States intended to exercise permanent control over Cuba, until the order was issued for the election of delegates to a constitutional convention. The language of this order is given in full:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Headquarters Division of Cuba,
"Habana, July 25, 1900.

"The military governor of Cuba directs the publication of the following instructions:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, by its joint resolution of April 20, 1898, declared—

" 'That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent;'

" 'That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people;'

"And whereas the people of Cuba have established municipal governments, deriving their authority from the suffrages of the people given under just and equal laws, and are now ready, in like manner, to proceed to the establishment of a general government which shall assume and exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, and control over the island: Therefore,

"*It is ordered,* That a general election be held in the island of Cuba on the third Saturday of September, in the year nineteen hundred, to elect delegates to a convention to meet in the city of Habana, at twelve o'clock, noon, on the first Monday of November, in the year nineteen hundred, to frame and adopt a constitution for the people of Cuba, *and, as a part thereof, to provide for and agree with the Government of the United States upon the relations to exist between that Government and the Government of Cuba,* and to provide for the election by the people of officers under such constitution, and the transfer of government to the officers so elected."

In its first recitals, this order set forth the pledge of Congress to leave the government and control of Cuba to its free and independent people. In its last recitals, it asserted the full performance and accomplishment by the people of Cuba of all the conditions prerequisite to the fulfillment of that pledge. In its conclusion, it ordered the election of delegates to a convention to frame and adopt a constitution for the people of Cuba, with the proviso that the government of Cuba to be established under the constitution should be bound in advance, by the terms of the constitution, to the government of the United States.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Cubans recognized at once the illusory character of a free and independent government tied by a string to the United States. They made an energetic protest against the objectionable part of the order, and demanded the elimination of the clause directing the insertion in the constitution of a provision fixing the relations of Cuba to the United States. Their protest was not heeded by the military governor, and the delegates were elected in pursuance of the order. The convention met in the city of Havana on November 5th, 1900. Most of its work was done in secret session. The convention resolved itself into a committee of the whole, which agreed upon the draft of a constitution to be reported to the convention. This constitution was read in public session, debated and adopted, section by section, with minor alterations and amendments. The material changes were few, as was natural, in view of the fact that all the members of the convention participated in the adoption of the draft of the constitution in the committee of the whole.

This constitution made no mention whatsoever of the United States. The delegates disregarded that portion of the order for their election which directed them to fix in the constitution an agreement with the government of the United States upon the relations to exist between that government and the government of Cuba. They provided for a government with full power for making treaties. By inference, it would appear that in their opinion the relations between Cuba and the United States ought to be the same as those which ordinarily exist by treaties between foreign countries. This action of the constitutional convention of Cuba puts the United States to the test of its good faith in the fulfillment of the pledge made by Congress in 1898. The issue has been made with dignity and firmness, but with a precision which cannot be evaded.

The reasons for this action by the constitutional convention are not far to seek. There is the desire for independence for its own sake. This sentiment was carefully cultivated as the foundation for a sustained revolt against the government of Spain. It was raised to the dignity of international recognition by the resolutions of Congress. It has become a powerful factor in the political situation in Cuba.

The mistake is frequently made of regarding the Cubans as an inferior race of people who must be governed as inferiors by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

arbitrary authority. That mistake was made and is still made by the American military government. No other mistake could have been more fatal to American influence in Cuba. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The Cubans are the descendants of a proud and haughty race which at one time was dominant in the affairs of the world. They have fallen into adversity. They have been reduced in political power from their former great estate. But they have retained their intellectual acumen and force, and have lost none of their pride, dignity and self-respect. They resent keenly, bitterly and properly the arbitrary domination of a foreign military government. Approached with courtesy and deference, they are amiable and pliable. Treated with indifference or disrespect, they are resentful to the limit of their power, and artful in devices to extend the limits of that power.

The mere existence, in the order for the convention, of a provision that the constitution should fix the relations to exist between Cuba and the United States was a sufficient reason for the firm and dignified disregard of that direction. The Cubans are weak and may be compelled to submit, but they have sufficient self-respect to prefer that the command be enforced upon them rather than that they should accept it as a rightful act.

A more substantial and permanent reason for the present unwillingness of the Cubans to accept a protectorate under the government of the United States is the intense animosity which they feel to the American military government. At the beginning of the American military occupation, many Cubans looked forward hopefully to the early annexation of the island to the United States. They believed that this annexation would take place easily and graciously. Actual territorial annexation failing for the time, they regarded a close commercial union and political alliance between Cuba and the United States as a certainty of the immediate future. To-day, the same people will not lift a hand or raise a voice in organized effort to create sentiment in Cuba favorable to annexation or alliance. They no longer express those sentiments because of their resentment towards the American military government. By reason of that resentment, they have become the silent allies of the original advocates of independence.

Every political, economical, commercial, financial, religious and professional factor in the social fabric of the Island of Cuba shares, to a greater or less extent, in this one sentiment of antago-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nism to the American military government. When the history of the military administration of Cuba is studied critically, the causes of this antagonism will be understood. One illustration will be given.

Cuba is a Roman Catholic country. The great majority of the people who have any religious convictions belong to the Roman Catholic Church. It is a doctrine of that church that the marriage relation is not simply a civil contract, but a divine sacrament.

Within five months after the American military occupation of Cuba, the American military governor, the representative of a great Christian nation, issued an order in which he declared religious marriages null and void, and directed that all marriages must be solemnized before civil officials. The effect upon the people of such military legislation on this subject may well be imagined. It remained in force for more than one year. The ears of American military officials were deaf to Cuban protests against the action of the military governor. The vigorous assistance of a member of Congress whose sympathies were enlisted in the cause secured a modification of this order. In the interval, the young people of Cuba, who had been brought up in the belief that the only lawful marriage in the sight of God was one solemnized by the church, found that sacred ceremony reduced to the rank of a wedding breakfast or reception which might be given to them by their clerical friends as an ornamental adjunct to the civil contract of marriage.

This was one instance. There were others less shocking to a universal religious sentiment, but none the less grievous to smaller circles in Cuba, whose opinions and prejudices, rights and privileges were offended and curtailed by the arbitrary and eccentric orders of the military governor.

The extent of this discontent with the American military administration is shown by the recent organization in the city of Havana of a "General Assembly of Economic Corporations and Political Parties." This "General Assembly" included the National and Republican parties and the Democratic Union, the Economic Association of the Friends of the Country, the Club of Agriculturists, the Union of Cigar Manufacturers and the Merchants' Exchange of the Island of Cuba. In addition to these organizations, municipal councils and commercial bodies through-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out the island have passed resolutions declaring their support and approval of the cause of the "General Assembly."

These diverse political parties and economic organizations have united in the common cause of relieving their country of burdens of taxation which are paralyzing its commerce and industries. For two years, Cuba has been barred from the negotiation of treaties of commerce and reciprocity with other countries. Her former market in Spain has been closed. Her tariff has been made at Washington, in the interest of Cuba as understood at Washington. The Cubans take a different view. Congress has not made or proposed any concession to Cuban products as compensation for the loss of other markets. American vessels have been permitted to engage in the coastwise trade of Cuba. No corresponding privilege has been accorded to Cuban vessels. An export duty has been placed upon Cuban tobacco, already deprived of any chance to secure by treaty of reciprocity favorable tariff rates in any foreign market. Other discriminations have been made in favor of American interests and adverse to Cuban interests. The Cubans have been generous enough to absolve the higher officials of the Government of the United States from deliberate intention of injuring Cuba. American interests were ever present and importunate. Cuban interests were remote and patient. But the resulting conditions have become intolerable. The declared purposes of this "Economic Movement" are three: the reduction of American duties upon Cuban imports into the United States; the suppression of export duties levied by the American military government upon Cuban products leaving Cuba; Cuban representation in the councils of the military government which imposes taxes upon the commerce and industry of the island.

Sugar and tobacco; stamp tax and tea; "no taxation without representation." How familiar it all sounds! Substitute the words "British" and "Colonial" for American and Cuban, and one would think these Cuban patriots were reciting the story of 1776!

What will the United States do? Will the national pledge be kept?

Many Americans do not hesitate to assert that this pledge should not be kept in the letter and spirit in which it was made; that we should give to Cuba a qualified sort of independence, subject to our protectorate and control. They dismiss the accu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sation of bad faith with the statement that upon entering a war no one can foretell the result; a pledge or declaration made at the beginning must be interpreted in the light of events at the end. The discussion of the moral merits of this sophistry would better be left to the casuists. Its advocates give an array of material reasons in defense of the proposed violation of our national good faith.

These reasons are four: fear of foreign seizure; necessity of naval stations for the United States Navy; Cuban incapacity for self-government; and protection to the commercial interests of the United States against unreasonable tariff duties and discriminations.

The form in which the first reason is presented is that the government of Cuba, its provinces and municipalities, will incur an extravagant indebtedness which they will be unable to pay; that this indebtedness may be contracted in England, Germany or France; that, in the event of non-payment, those countries may send warships to Cuba and seize upon the island; and that the only restraint upon this extravagance and consequent seizure is the control and protectorate of the United States.

Even under an American protectorate, Cuban loans may be placed in foreign countries, and if these are not paid nothing will prevent foreign governments from sending warships to Cuba and seizing the island, except the power and authority of the United States. That power and authority can be used to deter foreign governments from seizing Cuba just as effectually without the protectorate. Seventy-seven years ago the United States assumed the international right to prevent European Powers from seizing territory on the American continent.

"With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power, we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."*

The United States was then much less able than now to enforce such a doctrine. It has been and will be respected by European Powers whenever asserted by the United States. The Monroe Doctrine covers Cuba.

* Message of President Monroe, Dec. 2, 1823.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Cubans have safeguarded the question of public indebtedness by constitutional limitations. Under the new constitution, the Cuban Congress may authorize loans by the general government, but it must at the same time provide the necessary income for the payment of interest and the redemption of the principal. The departmental governments may authorize loans for departmental public works, but they must at the same time vote the permanent income necessary for the payment of interest and the redemption of the principal. The loans must have the approval of two-thirds of the municipalities of the department. The municipalities may authorize loans for municipal purposes, but they must at the same time designate taxes which are to be pledged for the payment of interest and the redemption of the principal. The loans must be submitted to the electors and approved by a direct vote of the people of the municipalities.

It is urged that naval stations in Cuba are necessary for the protection of our coast, and for the protection of our interests in the proposed Nicaragua Canal. All these stations could be had for the asking, if they were requested instead of demanded. There will be no difficulty in making a treaty with Cuba for the concession of naval stations in return for the naval defense of the coasts of the island. The Cubans well know the value of naval defense from foreign aggression. It will be difficult for them to raise the funds and revenues necessary for the construction and maintenance of a Cuban navy. It will be greatly to their advantage to have the protection of the navy of the United States. No foreign government will make such a treaty with Cuba, in the face of opposition from the United States. A costly navy or a treaty with the United States will be the only alternatives available to Cuba. The responsibilities of the United States under a treaty will not be greater than under annexation or a protectorate; nor greater than they have been under the military government for the past two years.

It is claimed that the Cubans are not capable of maintaining a stable government which will protect life and property. No fact in the history of the Cuban people is cited in support of this proposition. The examples of Hayti and San Domingo are held before the eyes of the American people, and it is assumed that the people of Cuba can do no better. So far as facts are available, they refute this conclusion.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The American census of Cuba has dispelled some erroneous impressions. The majority of the people are not indolent, ignorant negroes. Of the total population, the native whites constitute fifty-eight per cent.; the foreign whites nine per cent.; the Chinese one per cent., and the people of colored and mixed race thirty-two per cent. In every province the native whites form a majority of the population.

For the purposes of government, the correct test of education is the ability to read. In accordance with American practice in illiteracy tables children under ten years of age are not included. Judged by this standard and rule, one-half of the white people of Cuba and more than one-fourth of the colored people are educated.

As indicating the prospects of stability of government in the immediate future, the statistics of the male population over twenty-one years of age have more value. These men constitute the possible voters and potential rulers of Cuba. They number 417,993, of whom forty-eight per cent. are able to read. They are classified in groups according to their declared citizenship—as Cuban citizenship; Spanish citizenship; citizenship in suspense, that is, citizenship of Spanish subjects who, at the date of the census, had not decided whether to remain Spanish subjects or to become Cuban citizens; and foreign or unknown citizenship.

Of these potential rulers of Cuba, seventy per cent. have declared themselves Cuban citizens; two per cent. are Spanish citizens; eighteen per cent. are holding their citizenship in suspense; and ten per cent. are citizens of other countries or their citizenship is unknown. The Cuban citizens of voting age number 290,905, of whom forty-one per cent. are able to read.

The bread winners of a country are not by nature anarchists. The statistics of men at work, or engaged in occupations for gain, in Cuba show most satisfactory conditions, when compared with the same facts in the United States.

	Total number.	Bread winners.	Per cent.
Cuba	815,205	555,974	68.2
United States	32,067,880	18,821,090	58.7

The colored men in Cuba show almost as great an average of industry as the white men.

	Total number.	Bread winners.	Per cent.
White males	563,113	385,470	68.4
Colored males	252,092	170,504	67.6

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Cubans have been trained for many generations in the forms of modern government. Their code of laws and system of institutions are as complete and perfect as any in this country. True, they have exercised the governmental functions under the authority of a superior government. So did the American colonists prior to the Revolution of 1776. The adherents of Spain took an active part in the government of the island. The Cuban patriots in two revolutions sustained the cause of independence against a superior government with great firmness and courage. They maintained a regular, though migratory, government, and conducted their military operations in conformity to the rules of modern war.

Since January 1st, 1899, the whole island has been in a state of profound peace and quiet. Local order has been maintained, not only in the cities in the immediate vicinity of the American camps, but in all other cities and villages and in the country, by the municipal police and the rural guard. Municipal elections were held in the month of June, 1900. The municipalities cover the entire island. The elections were conducted in the most orderly and satisfactory manner. The election officers were Cubans, chosen by Cubans.

"No United States soldier or officer was present at or in the neighborhood of any polling place. There was no disturbance."*

The elections for the delegates to the constitutional convention were held in the month of September, 1900, with the same record and the same results.

"The election was wholly under the charge of Cubans, and without any participation or interference whatever by officers or troops of the United States."*

The constitutional convention has gone about its work in a quiet and unostentatious fashion and has prepared a constitution which ought to silence the most captious critics. It provides for a republican form of government. Cuba is divided into six departments, corresponding to the present provinces. The central government consists of a President, Vice-President, Senate, House of Representatives and Supreme Court of Justice. The distribution of executive, legislative and judicial functions is very similar to that in the Constitution of the United States. The President is to be elected for the term of four years and cannot be re-elected

* Annual report of the Secretary of War.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for three consecutive terms. The Senate is to be composed of thirty-six senators, six each from the six departments, elected for terms of six years. One-third of the senators will retire every two years. The House of Representatives is to be composed of one representative for every 25,000 inhabitants. With the present population, that ratio gives a House of sixty-three members. The representatives are to be chosen by direct vote of the people for terms of four years. One-half of the members will retire every two years.

Local government is vested in the departmental governments and the municipalities. The departmental governments consist of a governor and a departmental assembly, elected by a direct vote of the people for terms of three years. The municipal governments consist of a mayor and common council, elected by direct vote of the people in the manner prescribed by law.

The clauses of the constitution which guarantee rights of person and property are of most public importance. All Cubans shall have equal rights under the law. All foreigners shall have equal rights with Cubans in the protection of their persons and property and in the enjoyment of civil rights. *Ex post facto* laws, and laws having a retroactive effect or impairing the obligations of contracts, are forbidden. The rights of persons in respect to unlawful arrests and detentions, trials and sentences, searches and seizures, are carefully guarded. The rights of free speech and free press, freedom of religious worship and separation of church and state, the right of petition and the right to meet in peaceable assembly without arms for all lawful purposes, are fully guaranteed. The penalty of confiscation of property cannot be inflicted, and no person can be deprived of his property, except for public use by due process of law after compensation has been previously made.

Last, but not least, the advocates of repudiation demand "protection to the commercial interests of the United States against unreasonable tariff duties and discriminations." This sounds well in the abstract. Undoubtedly, it is the duty of our government to secure, wherever possible, "protection to the commercial interests of the United States against unreasonable tariff duties and discriminations." It is a duty in the performance of which our State Department is engaged in the continual negotiation of treaties of commerce and reciprocity. Why not demand constitu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional guarantees from Mexico, Canada or Spain? Why select Cuba as the first victim of a new policy of foreign constitutional protection to American commerce? Is there any reason why the Cubans should be suspected of sinister designs upon the commerce of the United States? Has the American military government of Cuba engendered such hatred of all things American that our merchants cannot trade there after the flag is gone? Will the imposition, by superior military force, of constitutional limitations upon the Cuban government place American commerce in a position of prestige and favor?

The theoretical discussion of the subject leads nowhere. The discovery of concrete American interests which will be affected by the independence of Cuba may cast more light upon the subject. There is the American merchant marine. For two years, American vessels have been permitted to engage in the coastwise trade of Cuba. No corresponding permission has been granted to Cuban vessels to engage in the coastwise trade of Florida. This privilege to American vessels was granted by the American military government, not upon equal terms with Cuban vessels, but with discriminations in favor of American vessels. An independent Cuban government may raise Cuban vessels to a position of equality with American vessels. The Cuban merchant marine may even be given some advantages in the coastwise trade of Cuba. American vessels may be relegated to the position of vessels of the "most favored nation." Is this an unreasonable discrimination against which the American merchant marine requires a constitutional guarantee from Cuba?

Tobacco and sugar are the two great staples of Cuba. American tobacco and sugar have the benefit of protective duties in the American tariff on Cuban imports into the United States. For the past two years, American tobacco has had an additional protection against competition from Cuban tobacco. This protection has been an export duty levied upon Cuban tobacco on leaving Cuba. Export duties were so obnoxious to the founders of our Republic that the Constitution of the United States contains a guarantee against them. This Cuban export duty was levied upon Cuban tobacco by the American military government, and has been maintained in spite of Cuban protests. The effect upon the tobacco industry of Cuba has been so disastrous that recently the duty has been reduced *one-half*. An independent government

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Cuba may remove this export duty entirely, and leave the American tobacco growers to the protective mercy of the Congress of the United States. Is this an unreasonable discrimination against which the American tobacco trust is entitled to a constitutional guarantee from Cuba?

Will some expert explain the constitutional guarantees against Cuban competition that American sugar ought to have? If these were put in definite and precise form, the problem of prescribing a constitution for free and independent Cuba would be simplified.

The path of national honor and duty is plain. Relegate naval stations and tariff schedules to the domain of diplomacy, where they properly belong. Inform Europe that the Monroe Doctrine applies to Cuba. Warn Cuba that the recurrence of political conditions subversive of law and order will be just cause for a second interference. With these admonitions, announce a final and definite policy to Cuba; that the constitution adopted by the convention will be submitted to the people of Cuba for ratification; that an election will be held for the selection of the officers provided for in the constitution; that the control of Cuba will be given to the Cuban government, so elected, as soon as it is properly installed and indicates its readiness and ability to exercise its functions.

The resolutions of Congress may have been the outcome of a spasm of false sentiment and bad judgment. That is a matter of opinion and of the past. Cuba asks for the fulfillment of our national pledge. It is a choice between national performance and national repudiation. No array of reasons, no juggling of words, can obscure that issue.

FRANK D. PAVEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE KING OF ENGLAND.

BY SIR CHARLES W. DILKE, BART., M. P.

THE selection of me by the Editor of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW to write upon the King of Great Britain and Ireland is thus far curious—that I am one of the least monarchic and the most republican in inclination of British Members of Parliament. At the same time, I am a practical politician, and just as I always felt and said, even a great number of years ago, that the difficulty of all suggestions for the adoption of republican institutions in the United Kingdom was that the cause of progress might be thrown back by the gathering of all Conservative sentiment round the concrete idea of restoration of monarchy, so I cannot but feel that, in the last quarter of a century, the growth in the Empire of India and of the Colonies has withdrawn the adoption of republican institutions from practical politics. The difficulty of the adoption of federal forms in the case of an Empire so dispersed, and representing forms of civilization so diverse, is immense. To bring India within the working of a Parliamentary constitution which would also include such democratic States as the Australian Commonwealth, is in my mind impossible; and the alternative means of keeping together the Empire is rather an increase than a diminution of the status of the King. Just as the Austro-Hungarian Empire has been kept together by the personality of the Emperor Francis Joseph, so the fabric of the British Empire must be kept together by full use of the sentiment which attaches to the person of the King.

When we come from the office to the individual, we in Great Britain cannot complain of what must be the usual doubt in the minds of those who have to do with the average and somewhat colorless princes of the European world. There is a difficulty, when we are dealing with what are commonly called "Royalties"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at large, in distinguishing one of them from another. This could never be felt of Queen Victoria, any more than it can be felt of persons of marked personality like the eloquent German Emperor, William II., or the clever King of Greece; and the long self-effacement of Edward VII., who became Prince of Wales immediately upon his birth, in 1841, has never succeeded in concealing the features of an individual standing out from the ordinary princely host. His character is marked by a cleverness, not, as is sometimes said, merely social. It is, too, all his own. His ancestry is diverse enough, but the extreme modernity or smartness of Edward VII. suggests his descent from Ethelred the Unready, through Mary Queen of Scots, as little as it does his descent from Alfred the Great. It is a creation of the second half of the last century. Neither is it derived from his parents. The Duke of Connaught reminds one of Prince Albert, and Prince Leopold used to remind one of the Queen. There has never been any such reminiscence of either side afforded by the eldest son.

Nothing can be more difficult than the position of a Prince of Wales, and especially that position when occupied by a man of considerable ability for an immense period of time, under the Kingship of a remarkable personage, and the Parliamentary rule of extraordinarily distinguished men. To be Prince of Wales for greatly over half a century, with Queen Victoria upon the throne gathering and using vast stores of accumulated kingly knowledge, and advised by men of the weight of Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli, and the others whose names are familiar to the world, is to invite a fate of triviality. That the subject of this sketch should have succeeded in playing his part with a very general approval, which has slowly ripened into a considerable national confidence, is in itself a testimony to the possession of powers, very different, indeed, from those of Queen Victoria, but also remarkable.

The necessity for constant public speaking, combined with total abstention from the expression of opinion on any political question, is in itself a heavy strain. The impartiality carefully inculcated upon British princes did not, from time to time, prevent the Prince of Wales from being described at Berlin as "a French agent;" but it has, when used with the personal care which in this matter he has always shown, absolutely prevented

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his being claimed as a partisan upon either side in English politics, or upon either side in connection with British relations, for example, with the Irish people.

The Heir Apparent to the British throne in international matters might be, and no doubt always wishes to be, a most useful informal negotiator. But even when there is no jealousy whatever upon the part of the king upon the throne, the jealousy of the distinguished statesmen who, from time to time, hold the office of Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs causes the Heir Apparent to be kept absolutely in the dark with regard to the matters which he would have to know if he were to be of much service to his country. There is reason to suppose that, when the British Heir Apparent at moments of delicate relations with foreign powers was visiting their capitals and calling upon their rulers, and even when, as has sometimes happened, he was invested with an official mission—such as carrying a Garter to a foreign king—his requests for knowledge of pending negotiations could not be complied with. If this exclusion has been felt, what wonder? The Prince Consort was the truest adviser of the Queen: to Baron Stockmar's somewhat inferior judgment the Queen, we know, deferred, as she did afterward to that of Leopold I., King of the Belgians. The late Prince of Wales, with less learning than his father, had more practical acquaintance with English modes of thought. He was, at an early age, the equal of King Leopold. It is an insult to him to compare him with a pedant like Stockmar. Yet, he was kept at arms' length from affairs.

It has often been pointed out that, as the private secretaries of Cabinet Ministers have access to every confidential document, it seems hard that the Heir Apparent should not be as much behind the scenes and equally trusted. Even when deeply interested, as the brother-in-law of the King of Greece must have been, in matters affecting the Greek throne, Edward VII., though connected by close ties of family and of friendship with the court of Athens, is said to have had information steadily refused to him. But English princes, at all events in recent reigns, have never attempted to play for their own hand, however justifiably, as, for example, the late German Emperor Frederick played, when, as Crown Prince, he thought it necessary to send to inform the German Liberal leaders that he had not seen the famous rescript of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the winter of 1880-1, until he read it in the newspapers. The Prince of Wales has been forced to express opinions only upon non-party matters. In 1880, he let his opinion be plainly seen in favor of a reform of the government of London; in 1885, he signed a unanimous report of the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes, of which he was a member under my Chairmanship; and, from time to time, he has thus come out of his political seclusion with useful results, but never in any matter where opinion was divided upon party lines.

In matters of etiquette and of social observance, the subject of this sketch has always made known his view with so much freedom and incisiveness as to make it clear that it was not the absence of observation and of feeling which has led to constant abstention from the expression of opinion in the larger matters of which we speak.

CHARLES W. DILKE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME PERILS OF THE POSTAL SERVICE.—I.

BY HENRY A. CASTLE, AUDITOR FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

THE people of this country, through their trustee, the Federal Government, are conducting the most gigantic business enterprise in the world—the United States Postal Service. The ramifying operations of this institution are being constantly expanded, and the vast volume of its pecuniary transactions is rapidly increasing.

That there may be a menace hidden in the manifest tendency to widen the sphere of a thing so popular, so useful, so necessary to our advancing civilization, will be a startling proposition to many readers.

The wonderful success which has attended this incursion of our government into the domain of state socialism, the accuracy and promptness with which this service is performed, have encouraged theorists who believe in extending the limits of governmental action to demand further experiments in the same line, all of them, strangely enough, to be attached to this already overloaded system. Every success attained by the intelligent and devoted servants of the Post Office Department, in carrying on its present operations, strengthens the arguments of those who advocate the imposing of additional functions upon it.

The postal service has earnings as well as expenses, receipts as well as disbursements, and it differs in this feature from other departments of the government. On this account, the work of the Bureau over which I preside, which is the counting-house and clearing-house of the entire system, is doubled in all its parts; since both the income and the outgo must, in all their items, be carefully audited and accurately recorded. The Auditor's Office is a branch of the Treasury Department, in order that its functions may be exercised in complete independence of the adminis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trative heads of the postal service. Prior to 1836, the Post Office Department kept its own accounts, auditing its own payments and allowances. Very serious scandals arose from this procedure, and, by recommendation of President Jackson in the year named, the present system was inaugurated.

The facts disclosed in our last annual report, that the grand aggregate of postal receipts and disbursements approximated $715,000,000 for the year which ended on June 30th, 1900, involving the handling by 515 employees in the Auditor's Office of 36,000,000 separate money vouchers, give some idea of the labor and responsibility involved in this work.

The items which go to make up the sum total of monetary transactions just given, are as follows:

Revenues of the postal service	$102,354,579.29
Expenditures of the postal service	107,249,298.13
Total amount of money-orders issued	255,670,027.98
Total amount of money-orders paid	249,120,285.82
Aggregate	$714,394,191.22

The revenues are largely derived from the sales of stamps and stamped paper; and a ledger account of these sales, together with credits for services and disbursements, must be kept with each of the 76,691 postmasters now in office. The average amount of 33,000,000 domestic money-orders issued annually is $7.90; the debit and credit for issue and payment of each order must be carefully audited, and a ledger account kept with each of the 30,024 postmasters authorized to deal in money-orders. Every order so issued and paid comes to the Auditor's Office as a voucher, where it must be handled five times, and checked twice by the postmaster's accounts, before the latter can be accepted as correct for entry in the money-order ledgers.

The enormous increase in aggregate money transactions may be gathered from the fact that they are exactly one-third greater in 1900 than in 1896.

The growth of the postal service is much more than an index of the nation's advance in population and wealth. It is the measure of a marvellous development of intellectual activity. The service is a colossal educational institute, quickening the mind and energizing the spirit of our entire people. Its expansion, compared with other elements of progress, has a startling significance.

The population of the United States in 1790 was 4,000,000; in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1900, it is over 76,000,000. The wealth of the people, in real and personal property, probably aggregated $2,000,000,000 in 1790, and is conservatively estimated at $80,000,000,000 in 1900. The number of post offices was 75 in 1790, and is 76,691 in 1900. The postal revenues were $37,975 in 1790, and $102,354,579.29 in 1900.

Therefore, while the population of the country has increased 19 to 1 in one hundred and ten years, and the wealth of the people 40 to 1, the number of post offices has increased 1,000 to 1 and the revenues of the service 2,700 to 1.

Meantime, the rates of postage have been reduced to a fractional part of those then prevailing, the speed of transmitting mails has been incredibly accelerated, safety and accuracy have been inconceivably increased, and innumerable features have been added to the service which the officials and patrons of those days lacked even the capacity to imagine.

In the light of these revelations, we may cease to wonder that, in volume of financial transactions, in number of officers and employees, in variety of functions and multiplicity of details, this service exceeds all other departments of the government combined. It is only a tangible incident of that unchallenged supremacy that the "blue book," or official register of the Post Office Department, is larger than its companion volume, which enumerates the servants of the nation in all its other branches—executive, legislative and judicial.

The phenomenal expansion which has characterized our postal system in the past has not only enormously increased the number of its employees and the volume of its transactions, but has engrafted upon it many additional features which were undreamed of by its founders. The primal idea was simply that of transporting letters and periodicals. There have been added what may properly be termed legitimate extensions of these functions, such as parcels-post or express service, free delivery by carriers, special delivery and the registry system—all of which may be called messenger service—the pneumatic tube service, railway postal car or travelling distribution service, and other minor attachments.

There has also been added a money order system, which has no direct functional relations with the mail service proper, as originally contemplated, but is a phase of banking business—the sale of domestic and foreign exchange.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The splendid executive faculty of the American race seems to have no limit to its capacity for extending the scope of financial and commercial enterprises. A business institution in private or corporate hands, as large as our postal service has become, could doubtless be managed on the administrative side without serious danger of collapse. Its growth along legitimate lines, both by increase of volume of business and addition of necessary new features, could, perhaps, be contemplated with equanimity on the theory that ability to manage grows with the responsibilities incident to management.

But whether such an enterprise under government auspices and subject to the vicissitudes of national politics, not only as to its general policy but as to the changing personnel of its executive heads, can continue to expand indefinitely, is a question for serious consideration. If our greatest railway systems, for example, were liable to have their ten or twelve leading officials changed every four years for purely political reasons, by which change new and entirely inexperienced persons were to be brought in, with all the risks incident to such a change, it is probable that the financial results on the market value of their securities would speedily reflect popular distrust of such methods. That the postal service is now so efficient is unquestionably due to the honest enforcement of Civil Service principles among its vast army of employees, and to the exceptionally able, devoted officials who have, by good fortune, been evolved through a very hazardous scheme of political selection during recent years.

Whether that good fortune can be trusted in the future to provide competent heads to manage the indefinite expansions of this great institution, remains to be seen. It is absolutely certain that to break down the Civil Service system now prevailing among subordinates, and to restore the whole department to the tender mercies of political manipulators, would bring chaos and confusion. In other words, we have built up a gigantic industrial and financial enterprise, the continued efficiency of which as yet depends far too much on the mutations of national politics.

These remarks apply to the purely administrative side of the problem. There is another side, which, even in the present status of affairs, suggests a far more menacing danger. The unsentimental, unattractive, unpopular work of auditing and bookkeeping, so that complete cognizance may be kept and complete

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accuracy assured in all the diversified branches of this institution, is the one in which all associated with that responsibility discern many imminent perils.

The American accounting system, entirely independent of the heads of the several executive departments, is the thing which stands as a restraint upon expenditures, being the right arm of the law-making, appropriating power, and holding all executive branches to a strict compliance with the wholesome restrictions of the law. Corrupt and decaying nationalities, such as Spain and Turkey, have no such system. The vigor of this function is a measure of our safe and solid national growth. The Auditors' Bureaus keep the accounts, scrutinize all the vouchers, see that each expenditure, however trivial, is made in compliance with law, and that the sum total of expenditures for any object does not exceed the appropriation made by Congress therefor.

This accounting system, so far as it relates to the postal service, has been the growth of sixty-four years, and ought to be by this time measurably complete. If it were perfect in its organization, ceaseless vigilance would be required to keep it in successful operation. But serious defects are disclosed, some of which cannot be remedied without additional legislation and a largely increased clerical force. During the present administration, at least one hundred improvements of greater or less importance have been made, some of them touching vital faults in this protective armor. Other defects, still more serious, have been pointed out by the head of the Bureau, but no adequate means have as yet been furnished him to apply the remedies.

Strange to say, the very corner-stone of the foundation of all debits against the postal service proper is entirely lacking. Substantially the whole revenues of the Post Office Department, amounting to over $94,000,000 a year, accrue from the sale of postage stamps, postal cards and stamped paper. These articles are delivered to the Department by contractors, and thence forwarded to postmasters for sale to the public. But no account has ever been opened on the books of the Auditor with the Department itself for these supplies. This account should have been started when postage stamps were first introduced, say fifty years ago, and kept continuously until this time. Similar accounts have always been rigidly kept, by the Auditor for the Treasury Department, with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue when-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever revenue stamps have been required by law. But, until very recently, it seems not to have occurred to anybody that this proceeding was necessary in the postal service; and it is doubtful whether the reform can be inaugurated until a considerable increase of clerical force shall have been granted.

Attention has been called by the Auditor, in at least three annual reports, to the notoriously defective methods employed in auditing claims for railway mail transportation. The expenditures under this head now aggregate more than $32,000,000 annually, and would seem to require special attention for the purpose of ascertaining amounts due before payment. But the Auditor's Office is not supplied with any of the data necessary to confirm the reports made to him by the Post Office Department as to what is due to each railroad quarterly for such service; and, if the data were supplied, there are no clerks available to make the audit. This glaring defect has been commented on in very severe terms by the Comptroller of the Treasury, the appellate officer of the whole accounting system, in a published opinion. The Auditor has appealed to Congress in vain for the additional help necessary to do this important work.

If this business were carried on by a partnership or corporation, it is safe to say that its accounts would be kept in such a manner that the profit or loss on each branch thereof could be readily ascertained. Unfortunately, there is abundant evidence that heavy losses occur in several branches, and it is equally unfortunate that the present accounting system has no method of ascertaining what those losses are. The different features are so interwoven, and there are so many expenditures as to which no attempt at sub-division among these features has been made, that the profitable elements are made to carry the unprofitable elements with little or no attempt to discover the amount of deficit, or to apply a remedy. All the public business of the country transmitted through the mail—including documents, correspondence, postal supplies, etc.—is carried without any compensation, and at a loss amounting in the aggregate to millions of dollars. Weekly newspapers carried free in the counties where published constitute another heavy item of total loss. Other newspapers, periodicals, serial novels and many thousands of tons of wholly undeserving "second class matter," pay only a fractional part of the cost of transmission. The money-order system is conducted at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a loss known to exceed $100,000 per annum. And the burden of seeking to make a profit which shall cancel these losses falls on letter postage alone, the writers of letters being thus taxed for the benefit of patrons of these several losing ventures.

It is a lamentable defect in our accounting methods that no attempt has ever been made to properly distribute expenses among the different branches. If the Government would pay, by adequate annual appropriation, for the transmission of its own mail matter; make another annual appropriation to cover losses on second class matter; advance money-order and registry fees so as to cover full cost of those conveniences; reduce to a reasonable figure rates paid for transporting mails by railroad, and secure absolute honesty in weights thereof—then the annual deficit would be wiped out and a large annual surplus would replace it. Out of this surplus, the service could be improved in many ways, and better salaries could be paid to deserving classes of employees who now receive less than they fairly earn. And, as the growth of business increased this surplus, the possibility of "penny postage" could be contemplated as something more tangible than an iridescent dream.

It is manifest that the entire accounting organization needs a thorough overhauling, and that its present status is full of peril, when we consider the certain rapid increase in business which each coming year must bring. An intelligent comprehension of the condition of different branches of the service can only be had by a correct determination as to the receipts and expenditures of each, such as would be secured in any private or corporate enterprise of equal magnitude.

The present administration of the Bureau is utterly powerless to effect such reorganization. It would require carefully matured legislation and a very considerable increase in the number of employees.

The dangerous concomitants which have been thus far suggested pertain to the postal service proper, that is, the collection, transmission and delivery of the mails. The money-order system, which is entirely outside those functions, and is, as has been stated, merely a phase of banking business, is a most popular and useful experiment in paternalism. It is a wonderfully convenient thing for the great masses of the people, and it is managed with enlightened zeal and energy by the Department officials who are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

charged with its administration. They work hard to make it safe and convenient, and to rapidly extend its operations.

Nevertheless, this service swarms with incongruities, temptations and perils, some of which should be corrected, and the contemplation whereof should at least inspire caution against embarking in other more extraneous and less excusable ventures.

In the first place, it has been conclusively demonstrated that the government is carrying on this business, in competition with private enterprise, at an actual loss. Statistics published in annual reports are made to show a large profit on the sale of money-orders, but those statistics take no account of many items of expense connected with the system which are paid out of other appropriations. Among these expenses are blanks, blank books and printed matter, clerical force in Post Office Department and Auditor's Office, service of Post Office Inspectors in money-order cases, salaries of money-order clerks in first and second class post offices, a proportionate share of postmasters' salaries, rent, light and fuel expenditures, etc. When all of these legitimate charges are taken into account, it is found that there is a very large balance annually on the wrong side of the ledger.

It is pointed out in the last Auditor's report that at least $75,000,000 of money-order funds are, by the present accounting system, at all times nominally in the hands of postmasters unaccounted for. The postmaster who sells orders transmits his reports of such sales to the Auditor, by whom they are necessarily held for a period averaging five months, before the orders, which constitute vouchers, can be assembled, assorted and checked against the reports. Not until that time are the postmasters' cash receipts properly accounted for. Meantime, there is abundant opportunity for heavy embezzlements and defalcations, which, in fact, are constantly occurring.

The opportunities for forgery are numerous, and forgeries outright, as well as successful attempts to raise the amount of money-orders, are of frequent occurrence, especially since a recent ruling of the Post Office Department permits money-orders to be paid at offices other than those on which they are drawn. Innocent postmasters, in almost every case, suffer by these forgeries; and, when the amount involved is large, they usually secure relief through Congressional action, the ultimate loss falling on the postal revenue.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Temptations to defalcation and embezzlement on the part of postmasters are enormously increased by the considerable amounts of money handled by them in connection with the money-order service. Postmasters are entitled to carry a reserve sufficient to meet any reasonable call for payment of orders drawn on them. This reserve is a sacred trust fund and should always be kept intact and held ready for inspection. But, among the 30,000 postmasters who sell orders, there are, of course, a proportion of dishonest, improvident or careless persons, who, in spite of all precautions taken by the authorities in Washington, dissipate these funds, and when confronted with their fault must take the consequences. Here, again, comes a loss to the government. If the bondsmen are insolvent, the loss is total. If they are solvent, Congress is appealed to for relief, and is seldom appealed to in vain.

A vivid illustration of ludicrously defective methods in money-order accounting which prevailed for several years, may be incidentally mentioned here. When I assumed the duties of Auditor, I found that all the accounts of the issuing postmaster were settled by checking his entries, not against the order which he had sold, but against a stub or coupon detached therefrom by him, which was supposed to state the amount of cash he had received. Accounts aggregating probably $600,000,000 had been settled in the Auditor's Office by this free and easy method. It was precisely like settling a customer's account at bank on his own list of checks issued, verified by the stubs of his check-book, without any scrutiny or comparison of the checks themselves. Orders could be, and were, issued for $100, entered on the coupon at $1.00, and the difference pocketed by the issuing postmaster, without risk of detection, since only the coupon, or stub, was compared with his statement. This was a time-saving device which had been put in operation with the sanction of law, but in utter defiance of the plainest dictates of business prudence. It was my pleasant privilege to promptly abolish this amazing procedure. In doing this, I was able to go back only six months, and recheck postmasters' accounts by the vouchers instead of the coupons. This operation disclosed over three thousand frauds and errors of greater or less magnitude, amounting in the aggregate to many thousands of dollars; and, by a strange fatality, ninety per cent. even of the so-called mistakes were against the government. How

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many more thousand mistakes and embezzlements lie concealed in the untouched accounts which antedate those we revised, will never be determined.

Under the current practice of paying money-orders at offices other than those on which they are drawn, an evil-disposed person could buy ten $100 orders at the New York city office, payable in Philadelphia; hold them for a short time; apply for and procure duplicates; present the latter at the Philadelphia office and receive payment; then immediately collect his original orders at Baltimore, and have abundant time to disappear entirely from public view before the fraud could be detected.

These statements of a few out of many palpable defects in the present service or its accounting methods, whereby embezzlements are invited, and frauds may be and, in fact, are constantly being perpetrated, will be sufficient to indicate to any thinking man, acquainted with business matters, the dangerous nature of the purely commercial enterprise in which our government is engaged. This enterprise has as its agents more than 76,000 postmasters, with each of whom is lodged more or less discretion involving opportunity and temptation. To more than 30,000 of these postmasters is committed the additional responsibility, with still larger opportunities and temptations, of dealing in exchange, on the credit of the government, and handling in trust a volume of money amounting in the aggregate to $255,000,000 a year. In addition, there are the 36,000 clerks and carriers employed in post offices, each with his own special field of possible operations of a fraudulent, financial character; and there are the railway mail clerks, the post office inspectors, the agents and employees of the new rural free delivery service, and the vast army of contractors for mail transportation, each of whom is a sworn officer of the government, under bonds to perform his duties. As has been intimated above, the task of maintaining the administrative organization of this enormous force, holding all its diverse elements to a strict, prompt and accurate discharge of their duties, gigantic as that task is, does not compare in difficulty with the other far less attractive one attached to the accounting bureau, which is obliged to gather up all the innumerable details connected with the financial responsibilities involved. This latter task, owing to rapid growth in all branches of the service, is advancing to a bewildering magnitude in aggregate figures. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

already approaches the thousand-million a year mark, and its strides are being accelerated year by year. Taking the service as it is, without any additional extraneous branches, the business and the labor are growing so much more rapidly than any other element of our social economy that we may properly pause to inquire: Whither does this all lead? Where will all this end? There is somewhere a limit to safety in this process of active expansion, even on its present basis. It must be manifest to any careful thinker that this limit to safety, this danger line, will probably be reached soon enough without unnecessary stimulus.

If ever a breakdown occurs in our governmental machinery, it is likely to be in the accounting office of our postal service, through adding weight to a burden which is already almost too grievous to be borne.

It is not beyond the power of human wisdom to devise means for perfecting the system which now exists, and taking care of any reasonable, legitimate growth thereof, provided ample means be granted therefor. A largely increased clerical force is needed now to take up the work thus far necessarily neglected, and a further liberal annual increase is needed to keep pace with its steady expansion, along established lines.

But as to the new features, such as the postal telegraph, the postal savings-bank, the postal railroad system and other schemes which are being influentially and persistently advocated—that is another story.

HENRY A. CASTLE.

(To be continued.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RECENT DISCOVERIES IN GREECE AND THE MYCENÆAN AGE.

BY CHARLES WALDSTEIN, SLADE PROFESSOR OF THE FINE ARTS IN KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

At the close of the great German excavations of Olympia, more than twenty years ago an archæological colleague remarked that, "with all the central sites of importance explored in Greece, there will be nothing left to excavate in classical lands." I maintained at the time—and have since repeatedly answered similar remarks made after every new excavation—that the period of most fruitful archæological research, with the help and on the basis of excavation, is not ended, but is only beginning now.

This applies even after the results of the most recent discoveries in Crete. For the brilliant achievement of the British excavators during the past year only marks a beginning of their work; while the schools of several nations are engaged in similar enterprise in other parts of that island; and it may be said that every civilized Western state (the United States, Germany and Austria are continuing their important work elsewhere) is contributing its share of material and intellectual effort to advance this important branch of science. The Italians, under Professor Halbherr, are engaged upon the sites of Gortyna, Phæstus, Axus and Eleutherna, and the French are at work on the extensive and important site of Goulas, as well as at Itanus. But the United States can well claim its share in this great archæological enterprise. For the beginning of this archæological activity in Crete in our own days may be said to have been made by the work of Professor Halbherr, with his discovery of the famous Gortyna inscription and his continuous study and exploration of the island ever since 1884; while, at an early date, he realized the importance of the site of Cnossus, which the intelligent energy and per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

severance of Messrs. Evans and Hogarth have now forced to yield up its treasures: A great part of Professor Halbherr's discoveries, however, were undertaken at the instance and with the material support of the Archæological Institute of America, among the active members of which the late Professor Augustus Merriam, of Columbia University, New York, was his chief supporter.

With such work as that pursued in Crete, as well as in Greece itself, Italy, Sicily, the other islands of the Ægean, in Asia Minor and Egypt, our historical horizon—nay, the regions well within the established border-lines of familiar history—are being, and will be, enlarged within our own and the succeeding generations, as they never were before, since the days of the Renaissance.

Moreover, it appears to me that, at the present time, individual scholars, archæologists and historians, in separate and independent spheres of study and exploration, are quietly marshalling forces which will tend to revolutionize the broad, fundamental views upon which the history of the European peoples has been built up, and which the generation preceding our own accepted as historical commonplaces. I am especially referring to broad distinctions which afforded the ground-work for the chief grouping in the various departments of historical study, ethnology, archæology linguistics. Recent discoveries in Egypt, notably those of Professor Flinders Petrie, as well as simultaneous work and discoveries in the various centres of the whole Mediterranean basin, from Spain through the Italian and Greek peninsulas, round the coast of Asia Minor to Egypt—these have all led us back to a period in which we must infer a certain unity, ethnological as well as archaeological, for all the inhabitants of this Mediterranean basin.

It will readily be perceived how revolutionary will be the action of such a view, when once it is fully established, upon the system of ethnological hypothesis hitherto adopted, as regards the prehistoric periods in the life of the peoples in the South of Europe, Asia Minor and in North Africa.

Startling as these discoveries are, there is no definite sphere of our past in which more striking and important discoveries have been made than in the one known as "Classical Antiquity." This period in man's history—the Hellenic and Græco-Roman—revered and admired for the height of civilization then attained, and for the predominant influence which it has had in successive

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ages down to our own days, has been so thoroughly elaborated on all sides by legions of competent scholars and thinkers from the Middle Ages onward, that the belief had sprung up and fixed itself in our minds that nothing more can be ascertained in this sphere of human inquiry, that this field has become sterile. And with this belief there has grown up, from motives working in another direction, a certain opposition (perhaps ungrateful and ungracious) to the long and continuous sway and predominance of classical studies, directed especially against the prominent place which they hold in our educational system. Yet, here again I venture to maintain that, among the leading features which will be recognized in the future as distinguishing the civilization of the nineteenth century, a revival of pure Hellenism (in contradistinction to the Hellenism that had passed through Rome) will be one of the most marked, and that classical study in the spirit of the nineteenth century will be readily differentiated from the classical spirit of the Renaissance, and of the Humanists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. To put it shortly and epigrammatically —in a type taken from the domain of art, though it applies to literature and thought as well,—it is the difference between the Apollo Belvidere and the Parthenon marbles as representative of Hellenism. Previous scholars studied their classical antiquities in Italy and Rome. We have gone to Greece itself.

Once on truly Greek soil, the generous, broad-breasted mother-earth of ancient Hellas has delivered to us some of her treasures, hidden away from rapacious time, and from the still more rapacious hands of the despoiling barbarians of later days, beneath the ample folds of her gracious garment. And thus there has grown up, in the immediate past and in our own days, a more adequate and a fuller knowledge of the highest development of Hellenic genius.

If thus there has been a new departure in our knowledge of the historical periods of ancient Greece and Rome, which promises to widen out as well as to intensify our accurate appreciation of that important period in man's history, there is another sphere of classical research in which our advance has been, and is, still more marked and startling; for it concerns regions about which we may say that we practically knew nothing before. This might be called the Præ-historic Period of Greek civilization—that is, the life in Hellenic lands before the records of ancient writers begin.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To indicate in a rough and ready manner the progress marked in this sphere of inquiry in our own days by the mere measurement of time, I would say that the actual number of years preceding the established records of Greek history, about which a few years ago we knew nothing and concerning which we now know something, has been pushed back at least five hundred years —nay, I venture to say, since 1892, a thousand years, namely, to about 2000, B. C. It requires some courage on my part to venture the prediction (for which I may, however, claim to have some serious grounds), that before many years we shall have sober data for pushing civilized life in Hellenic lands backwards, not by centuries, but by millennia, or to about 4000, B. C.

Light has been thrown on this earliest period of Greek civilization from various quarters of exploration and discovery, from Sicily and the South of Italy, from several islands of the Aegean, and from Asia Minor; while a powerful side-light has come from Egypt and the most recent discoveries there. But the whole sphere of this new field of fruitful inquiry was first opened out by the excavations of Henry Schliemann, followed by further excavations, which all supplement one another in the evidence they furnish for the earliest civilization in ancient Greece.

It is to three groups of excavations that I attribute the new and startling ground of inquiry upon which we stand at the present day. The first is the Schliemann group, at Mycenae, Tiryns, Hissarlik, etc., to which the excavations of the Greek archaeologist Tzountas form an important addition, while Schliemann's work has been ably carried on since his death by his former assistant, Dr. Dörpfeld. The second important excavation in this sphere is to be found in the American Excavations of the Argive Heraeum by the American School of Athens and the Archaeological Institute of America; and the third, not yet completed, form the striking discoveries in Crete now made by the British School of Athens and by Mr. Arthur Evans.

All this important work, with its far-reaching results upon the system of man's knowledge of his past, may be said to have originated in the active brain of a poor boy living in a small village of Mecklenburg, whose unassuageable thirst for knowledge was never stimulated or satisfied by the advantage of such early education as is within the reach of most poor men in the Western

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States of our own day. But it was in the brain of that boy, when he came to realize what the barrows and mounds, the "Hun graves," of his own home stood for, and when he made acquaintance with the story of Homer's heroes, that the idea took shape of excavating the ancient sites which contained the tangible records of the heroic life as depicted in Homer. And with the tenacity and singleness of purpose, the indomitable strength of will with which he held fast to this idea through all the years of strife and suffering in the surging and often debasing struggle for material means of subsistence, and the un-ideal and un-poetic allurements and fascinations of the greed of gold—amid all these, he clung to the dream of his early boyhood, he kept alive the fire of his enthusiasm as the one high beacon light which raised him above the "practical," and worse than practical, conditions of his peculiar career.

It *was* his "fixed idea," as the alienists are wont to characterize the thought, or the pursuit in thought, out of proportion with the accepted order of life among the dominating majority. It appears to me that we all have such fixed ideas, thoughts and interests and aspirations, ever present, consciously or sub-consciously dominating, or at least directing and giving their tone to our every effort and desire,—some trivial and vulgar, some weighty and refined, some malignant and criminal, others beneficent and in harmony with the social order which they tend to confirm and to advance. They produce the heartless worldling, the unscrupulous speculator, the selfish, cruel and unmotherly woman, the thief and the murderer; but they also produce the philosophers and the artists, the enthusiasts and the heroes, the saints and the martyrs. It all depends upon the nature of the fixed idea; for the strength of purpose, the energy and perseverance, in themselves, are good and mark a virtue. When the "idea" is directly and all-engrossingly one's little self, anaemically petulant or raised to cosmical proportions by a passionate imagination, it produces the egoist. When the "idea" is bad and unsocial, it makes a criminal; when it is great and good, it makes a great man. Henry Schliemann was a great man.

When, as an apprentice in a grocer's shop in Holland, at night in his cold garret, and in the intervals of sweeping the shop, he taught himself the classical languages as well as most modern tongues; and when, subsequently, in Russia and in the United

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States, he succeeded in accumulating a fortune, he returned to the great fixed idea of his childhood—the idea which had lighted his garret and kept it warm, and had thrown its soft redeeming lustre upon the more sordid phases of his subsequent "successful career," as it now does for us upon the memory of his life. And when he then retired from business, and devoted his fortune and his energies first to the Excavations of Mycenae, then of Tiryns, and then of Hissarlik, and when he brought before the world the treasures which he unearthed in Mycenaean tombs and palaces, claiming (sometimes on unscientific grounds, and with the intelligible and pardonable haste of enthusiasm) to have found the treasures of the Atreidae, the very bones of Agamemnon and his Homeric associates, there was a great outcry throughout the learned world against the unwelcome intrusion of this "impostor" into the sacred precincts of the learned guild. The more charitable considered the "fixed idea" to have taken a distinctly pathological form.

Though this is hardly twenty-five years ago, it is all forgotten. What has survived are the walls and buildings of the ancient Mycenae, Tiryns and Troy—the centre of the life of these ancestors of the historical Greeks that fought at Thermopylæ, Plataea, and Salamis—here are the tombs in which they were buried, the implements of peace and war which they used, here are the crystallized feelings and thoughts which drove artists and craftsmen to construct and fashion objects which are there for us to touch, and upon which we can feast our eyes in the present day, and that reflect in their totality the actual life of the past, in their way as indubitably and adequately as does the written, nay, the spoken word.

The treasures of gold and precious metal exhibited in the Museum of Athens, the hundreds and thousands of objects in various materials that have since accumulated in so many museums, all have undoubtedly established for us the existence of a civilization reaching far beyond the year 1000, B. C., further back than the Dorian Invasion, and manifesting to the careful student, a gradual organization and development in time, which enable him to distinguish several marked phases as far back as, at least, the fifteenth century, B. C. For the last twenty-five years, through the mass of material furnished by Schliemann's spade, archaeologists have been enabled to build up a systematized presentation of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an age in Hellenic life of which the student, before 1874, knew nothing, and of which he had not even the vaguest conception.

The next important group of excavations, which appears to me to mark a new departure in thus extending the horizon of what we know of the earliest Greek civilization, are the American Excavations at the Argive Heraeum. Some of the results of these excavations, which covered four seasons from 1892-1895, have been given to the public in a preliminary form in the official organs of the American School and Institute.*

The exceptional importance of the Argive Heraeum lay, in the first instance, in the facts that, in the age of Pericles, it was one of the foremost sanctuaries of the whole of Greece, that it contained the great gold and ivory statue of Hera by the sculptor Polycleitus, second only in fame to Pheidias, and that the sanctuary retained its eminence through all periods of Greek history down to the Roman times—for all of which facts our excavations have yielded archaeological testimony. But it is also exceptionally important from the position which it held in the earliest periods of Greek civilization, in which we are here interested. For we must always remember that, whereas Tiryns and Mycenae and the city of Argos represented each one period and phase in the political development of the Argive plain, the Heraeum probably antedates the foundation of Tiryns,† and always maintained its importance as the religious centre through the successive periods of Argive history. Moreover, from the literary traditions of later periods, as well as from the actual archae-

*See reports of the American School of Athens in the American Journal of Archæology since 1892 as well as a special publication which the writer published in 1892, called "Excavations of the American School of Athens at the Heraion of Argos." On the question with which we are especially concerned here, there is a paper in a recent number of the Journal on the "Earliest Hellenic Art and Civilization and the Argive Heræum." Since the excavations were completed in 1895, several years were required to arrange, clean and examine the thousands of objects which were deposited in the Central Museum of Athens. Upon this arduous task several of my collaborators in the excavations have been assiduously engaged for some years. But the whole of my manuscript, as well as that of most of my collaborators, has been ready for print for more than a year; and it is unfair to the scientific world, as well as to my assistants and myself, that the publication should be further delayed. These assistants and associates were engaged at the work for shorter or longer periods, while some have undertaken the publication of portions of our finds; they represent many of the leading universities in the United States. Among them, I must mention Drs. Hoppen, Washington, R. Norton, Brownson, Richardson and Poland, Messrs. De Cou, Tilton, Chase, Fox, Heermance, Lythgoe, Meader, Alden and Rogers. It is especially vexatious to think that so important a publication should be delayed for want of funds, and I can hardly believe that people interested in archæology in the United States would allow this to be the case.

†See an article of the present writer in a recent number of the Classical Review, in which he endeavors to show that the site of this temple contains the remains of the earliest city in this district.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ological remains, the Argive plain and the people inhabiting it refer to the earliest and most specifically Hellenic period of Greek civilization. It is on this account that the Argive Heraeum becomes, for the questions with which we are dealing, more important than in Greece, Mycenae and Tiryns and Hissarlik (Troy) of Asia Minor.

The third group of excavations on prae-historic Greek sites, those directed by Mr. Arthur Evans and Mr. Hogarth, are still in progress. But even now they have yielded most startling results of the highest interest and importance. In fact, so far as we are able to judge, nothing of so striking a nature has been found since the days of Schliemann. We may safely say, however, that up to this moment all that has been found at Cnossus only refers to what is known as the Mycenaean age, the date of which cannot at present be pushed much further back than the fifteen century, B. C. So far, these excavations will have to be supplemented by those of the Argive Heraeum; for, on the ground of the actual remains and monuments there discovered, I have ventured to classify our material so that we have justifiable cause to go back on this site to about the year 2000, B. C. Since then, Professor Flinders Petrie has found the earliest forms of Mycenaean pottery (Aegean he calls it) in tombs which he identifies with the first Egyptian dynasty. I venture to assert now, what I could not say, from the character of the evidence with which I meant to deal, in the paper I published last spring, namely, that the earliest walls, vases, terra-cottas and other objects found at the Argive Heraeum may well mark many centuries of continuous development, nay, perhaps millennia, before the year 2000, B. C.

In spite of the numerous remains of the Prae-Mycenaean age, found at the Heraeum and elsewhere, which enable us to establish groups and classifications in this earliest development of Greek craft, we must admit that we have little fuller and more detailed knowledge concerning these periods *as yet*. On the other hand, for the Mycenaean age we have a vast amount of material, all tending to give a fairly complete picture of the life and civilization in these centres, and to these discoveries Messrs. Evans and Hogarth have contributed more effectually than any other archaeologists since the day of Schliemann.

The accumulated "Mycenaean" material before us clearly gives us the impression of a civilization of a very high order, in which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people lived in a developed social organization, in ease and comfort, nay, in luxury. The various handicrafts and arts were practiced with great variety and proficiency: wood, ivory and metals were carved, turned, beaten, soldered and combined in the most skilful manner; architecture and painting and architectural sculpture reached a comparatively very high stage of perfection, a stage higher than we have evidence of for several centuries succeeding this era. And now, through the most brilliant discovery of Mr. Evans, we learn that they even possessed the art of writing. For he has found written documents in the Hellenic lands at least seven centuries earlier than the first known monuments of historic Greek writing.

"In the chambers and magazines of the Palace there came to light a series of deposits of clay tablets, in form somewhat analogous to the Babylonian, but inscribed with characters in two distinct types of indigenous prehistoric script: one hieroglyphic or quasi-pictorial, the other linear. The existence of a hieroglyphic script in the Island has been already the theme of some earlier researches by the explorer of the Palace, based on the more limited material supplied by groups of signs on a class of Cretan seal-stones, and the ample corroboration of the conclusions arrived at was, therefore, the more satisfactory. These Cretan hieroglyphs will be found to have a special importance in their bearing on the origin of the Phoenician Alphabet.

"But the great bulk of the tablets belonged to the linear class, exhibiting an elegant and much more highly developed form of script, with letters of an upright and singularly European aspect. The inscriptions, over a thousand of which were collected, were originally contained in coffers of clay, wood and gypsum, which had been in turn secured by clay seals, impressed with finely engraved signets, and counter-marked and countersigned by controlling officials in the same script, while the clay was still wet. The clay documents themselves are, beyond doubt, the Palace archives. Many relate to accounts concerning the Royal Arsenal, stores and treasures. Others, perhaps, like the contemporary cuneiform tablets, refer to contracts or correspondence. The problems attaching to the decipherment of these clay records are of enthralling interest, and we have here locked up for us materials which may some day enlarge the bounds of history."

As regards the architecture of the Mycenaean period, we must now realize that the Cyclopean walls and buildings of Tiryns, as well as the supporting wall of the earlier Argive Heraeum, all mark a more primitive stage than what we call Mycenaean. The walls and buildings of Mycenae itself represent a transition from the earlier Cyclopean system of Tiryns to the specifically Mycenaean phase of architecture; while the purest form of Mycenaean architecture, corresponding to the description of buildings in Homer,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was first found at Troy, in the sixth layer from below, by Dr. Dörpfeld in 1893.

Yet, all these buildings are surpassed in splendor and in the quality of masonry by the great palace which Mr. Evans has found at Cnossus in Crete. There is every reason to believe that the palace here discovered, with its maze of corridors and tortuous passages, its numerous small chambers, its long succession of magazines with their blind endings, was the palace of Minos, which later tradition made the habitation of the fearful Minotaur —in fact, the famous Labyrinth. Mr. Evans, moreover, proposes an ingenious hypothesis (a suggestion before made on philological grounds by Professor Max Meyer), according to which the Labyrinth really derived its name from the *labrys* or double axe, the emblem of the Cretan Zeus, which he found repeated continually on monuments and objects from this site.

It will be best to give his own words in describing the palace he has discovered:

"At but a very slight depth below the surface of the ground the spade has uncovered great courts and corridors, propylaea, a long succession of magazines containing gigantic stone jars that might have hidden the Forty Thieves, and a multiplicity of chambers, pre-eminent among which is the actual Throne Room and Council Chamber of Homeric Kings. The throne itself, on which (if so much faith be permitted to us) Minos may have declared the law, is carved out of alabaster, once brilliant with colored designs and relieved with curious tracery and crocketed arcading, which is wholly unique in ancient art, and exhibits a strange anticipation of Thirteenth Century Gothic. In the Throne Room, the Western Entrance Gallery and elsewhere, partly still adhering to the walls, partly in detached pieces on the floors, was a series of fresco paintings, excelling any known examples of the art in Mycenaean Greece. A beautiful life-size painting of a youth, with an European and almost classically Greek profile, gives us the first real knowledge of the race who produced this mysterious early civilization. Other frescoes introduce us to a lively and hitherto unknown miniature style, representing, among other subjects, groups of women engaged in animated conversation in the courts and on the balconies of the Palace. The monuments of the sculptor's art are equally striking. It may be sufficient to mention here a marble fountain in the shape of a lioness's head with enamelled eyes, fragments of a frieze with beautifully cut rosettes, superior in its kind to anything known from Mycenae; an alabaster vase naturalistically copied from a Triton shell; porphyry lamp with graceful foliation, supported on an Egyptianizing lotus column. The head and parts of the body of a magnificent painted relief of a bull in gesso duro are unsurpassed for vitality and strength."

If we examine the numerous smaller objects of art which have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

come down to us from the various centres of Mycenaean life, we are impressed with the exceptionally high standard which these convey to us, even when compared with the art of other countries and of the earlier centuries of historical Greece. The numerous gold, silver, and bronze ornaments and implements deposited by Schliemann in the Museum of Athens alone clearly illustrate this. The well known silver ox-head, reproduced in all text books on Greek Art, the splendid sword-blades with chased patterns and hunting scenes incrusted into the bronze in gold variously shaded, and, above all, the two splendid gold cups which Tzountas found in the bee-hive tomb of Vaffio not far from Sparta, illustrate this fully.

In perfect *repoussé* work these cups are ornamented with scenes showing the capturing and taming of wild bulls. All these display not merely the love of splendor and luxury, but also a feeling for life and nature, for truth and naturalism in art, a freedom and skill in the technical processes by means of which these scenes are rendered, which came to us as a revelation as regards the high state of artistic feeling in this early period.

The wall-painting with the bull from Tiryns had given us some faint notion of these characteristics of freedom and naturalism on a larger scale, which mark all the Mycenaean vase-paintings in the more decorative region of minor art, and were so pronounced in the Vaffio cups. But photographs from the wall-paintings of the palace at Cnossus are, in this respect, as much a revelation as the Vaffio cups were for their goldsmith's work.

Religious worship at Cnossus appears not to have taken place in a separate temple, but, according to Mr. Evans, in small shrines and altars in the palace itself. Moreover, he holds that the religion itself was of the crudest, and that, with all surrounding splendor, the Mycenaean people at Cnossus were still addicted to tree and pillar worship, a form of fetishism of which he has discovered clear traces in numerous extant pillar-like objects which they thus adored. I do not think that this worship is directly expressive of the "Mycenaean" peoples; but marks a survival of earlier cults established many centuries before the Mycenaean age. Nor need we be astonished at the persistency of such more primitive survivals; for the comparative study of cults in all climes and times shows similar conditions of incongruous survivals.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With all the splendor and high artistic development in the objects hitherto found in Mycenaean centres, we must be struck by the fact that sculpture and painting, other than in *decorative* forms, did not exist. I mean that the Mycenaean peoples did not produce the *picture* and the *statue*. This development of the purest and highest art was left for the Greeks of the great historical ages to establish for mankind.

If we attempt to summarize the impression which the art of the Mycenaean people produces in us, one word will, to my mind, convey most clearly the essential nature of their art, and will help us to realize the stage of political and social development which they attained. This word is *palatial*.

In spite of the various artistic qualities in Mycenaean art to which I have referred above, one quality they all seem to me to possess before all things, is splendor. The intrinsic value of the material is never quite ignored. While a Tanagrean figurine of the fifth and fourth centuries, B. C., though distinctly an object of minor art and not from the hand of the great masters, represents adequately the supreme artistic charm and spirit of the period and the land which produced it, the Mycenaean terra-cotta figurine is of the crudest and most primitive form, hardly symbolical of the human figure, and thus stands in strongest contrast to the splendid work in the gold cups. The costly articles found in the great bee-hive tombs differ essentially in artistic quality from those found in the poorer tombs. Painting and architecture are made subservient to the needs of those who dwell in the palace, and whose remains are enshrined in the splendid bee-hive tombs of which the "Treasury of Atreus" is the finest specimen. They built no great temples, because they had no national religion in the higher sense, and the tribal worship was housed in the palace of the ruler to whom it was made subservient. The real development of Mycenaean art groups round, and depends upon, the ruler, and is to be found in his palace and in his tomb. No doubt, this palace crowned the citadel which offered protection to the surrounding district; but the ephemeral mud-huts about it have not left a trace of their existence. There was no *national* life. It looks as if the citadels fortified by rude walls of small stones, and then supplemented by gigantic Cyclopean structures which are Prae-Mycenaean, had more of the *national* character in them than the palaces of the Mycenaean rulers. The earliest set-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tlements on the Heraeum point to that political phase leading to the *Synoikismos,* which brought the scattered dwellers in the Argive plain together for protection to the Acropolis chosen by their leader, their chief clansman—not their tyrant.

But these early political communities were too poor; there was—if I may use the term without approbrium—not enough of the luxury element in their life, there was not the surplusage of energy and moral vitality to produce a higher art; though the germs of Mycenaean art are to be found in their humbler remains. Yet in the *palatial* art of the Mycenaean rulers, as in the East, the idea of splendor, of impressiveness by size or value of material, was too dominant to create the *statue* and the *picture,* the national pure art of Greece. With their downfall, the Dorian invader, ruder and more vigorous, for the time impoverished life, and he had to be assimilated into the national body and raised to higher political and social levels; and thus art sank again for a time after the Mycenaean period. Preceding the great art of the Hellenic climacterix in the fifth century, B. C., we must remember that, in the sixth century, there was also a period of magnificence among the "tyrants" of that age, which definite political and social causes converted, after the Persian War, into the great art of the Periclean age—the adequate expression of the highest period in ancient history. It almost looks as if we had here to deal with an historical "law" concerning the development of art as the outcome and the expression of social and political evolution. For we could trace similar phenomena in other countries and periods of history.

Before Greek life could become national and their great national art could be evolved, the luxury of the Mycenaean people had to be swept away. This was done by the sturdy Dorians. And when, during the succeeding centuries, the vigorous Dorian element was blended with the earlier dwellers in Greek lands, and a healthy national life was evolved—a common language, a common literature and a common religion, giving expression to and fixing this process of wider nationalization—then the elements of the Mycenaean spirit, which survived in Greece and flowed back from the centres (the islands and Asia Minor) where it had taken refuge, revived in a wider and nobler form; and gradually, by successive stages which we can trace in so interesting a manner, it revived in the establishment of true Hellenism in politics, in philosophy, in literature and in art.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It may be well to point out that the term "national" is distinctly not used by me in the spirit of Chauvinism which has been given to it in our days. By "national," I really mean the widening out of common ideas and ideals among a large number of people, so that this common civilization manifests itself in a social or political unity. The higher and nobler these ideas; the wider the area; the greater the number partaking of, and stamped in their individual character by, such common ideas and standards of thought and morals, public or private,—the higher is human society. In Athens all full citizens were thus integral parts of this common civilization—though there was an aristocratic groundwork to their state, in that it contained slaves. The Italian republics had similar width and limitations. In our days, the democratization of all civilized states may at times lower the standard of these ideas, but their extension and expansion is incalculably greater than ever before. In fact, there are for this unity no limits within the geographical and ethnological boundaries of each nation, however much the "nationalists"—those with materialist or with idealist proclivities—wish for such restriction. But more and more we are coming to realize that the Renaissance in Italy and the Abolition of Slavery are as much a fatherland as are England, Germany, France, Italy and the United States.

CHARLES WALDSTEIN.

When the last words of this article were written a telegram from Naples announced the discovery of a perfect statue by the famous sculptor Polycleitus, the contemporary and rival of Pheidias. We heard recently of other works of sculpture found in the excavations in the Forum of Rome. Considering the fact that, unfortunately, even in the highest intellectual pursuits, there is the dominance and vulgarization of "fashion" and ephemeral waves of unbalanced enthusiasm, I should like to take this opportunity of saying that, in spite of all the supreme interest in the discoveries concerning prehistoric Greece to which this article has drawn attention, the fact that the Italian discoveries lately announced refer to the highest period of Hellenic civilization, and present us with ideals of beauty and truth then realized for all times, need not diminish our interest in, and our enthusiasm for, the study of the archaeology of historic Greece and Rome.

C. W.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP OF NATURAL MONOPOLIES.

BY RICHARD T. ELY, PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL ECONOMY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

THE question under discussion relates to the ownership and management of those local businesses which furnish what are called public utilities. The principal classes of these public utilities are water, light and transportation. They are called monopolies because, as we know from experience, we cannot have in their case effective and permanent competition.

It is often said that we do not want to decide the question of municipal ownership in accordance with general principles, but that each case should be decided as it arises. If New York City desires public ownership of water-works, it is urged, let New York City by all means try the experiment. But let New Haven, if the people of that city so desire, continue private ownership of water-works. Still others say, let us adhere to private ownership until we find that we have made a serious mistake in so doing. Both these attitudes imply the renunciation of science, or a denial of the possibility of a scientific solution of the problem. Imagine such an attitude in engineering as applied, let us say, to bridge-building. The result would surely be disaster. The outcome of this attitude in what we may call applied economics or social engineering has likewise been disastrous. Mistakes have been made which it has not been possible to correct, or which have been corrected with great loss. The private ownership of water-works in London, which still persists, although recognized to be an evil many years ago, affords an illustration. If at length this evil is corrected, it will cost the taxpayers many millions of dollars which might have been saved. Innumerable illustrations could be afforded, did space permit. What must be desired by any one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who has an appreciation of the nature of modern science, is the establishment of general principles whereby mistakes may be avoided and loss prevented. The practical man will naturally take into account the actual, concrete condition in his application of general principles. The social engineer must, in this particular, follow the practice of the mechanical engineer.

When we approach the question of public ownership *versus* private ownership of such great industries as those connected with artificial light and transportation, our attention is attracted by the municipal corruption which exists, particularly in our own country. The fact of this municipal corruption, and also the further fact of the very general incompetency in the management of municipal affairs, are not called in question, and they are not under discussion. The corruption and incompetency may not everywhere be so bad as many pessimists imagine, and it may, furthermore, be true that, in both respects, we have in many cities witnessed gratifying improvement. Yet, when we have made these admissions, the true state of the case is bad enough. The civic conscience with us is slow of development. The satisfactory performance of public duties implies, in some particulars, a higher civilization than we have reached. It requires some development of the imagination to see the harm and suffering brought to countless individuals by lapses in civic virtue. Furthermore, it implies a higher development of conscience than that found in primitive man, to reach that state in which there is a conscious desire to abstain from all acts which may hurt people who are not seen. Many a man will give to a poor widow, whom he sees, money to relieve her distress, but, at the same time, will not hesitate to increase the burdens of poor widows whom he does not see, by fraudulent evasion of taxation.

The sort of men now in our municipal councils are not the kind of men to whom we would gladly turn over vast business interests. The very thought repels us. Whether or not they are morally better or worse than the men who in many cases are said to corrupt them, and who now exercise an important influence in the management of privately owned public utilities, it is freely conceded that they are less fit for the conduct of important businesses. We want street railways managed by men who understand the street-railway business, gas-works managed by men who understand the gas business, and neither class of enterprises man-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aged by men whose gifts are most conspicuous in the partisan manipulation of ward politics. It is important that it should be understood that the advocates of municipal ownership do not call in question the fact of municipal corruption and inefficiency in the management of public business, and that they have no desire to turn over the management of public utilities to a class of men who must still be considered typical in the municipal council of the great American city.

But when we have admitted freely corruption and inefficiency in municipal government, it still remains to examine into the causes of these conditions, for there is a very widespread suspicion that a large share of the responsibility therefor must be laid at the door of private ownership. A real, vital question is this: Would we have the same class of men in our common councils which we now find there, should public ownership replace private ownership? Is it true that private ownership places in office and keeps in office some of our worst municipal wrong-doers? It is important that the reader should understand the real nature of the problem under discussion, and it is believed that these questions which have just been asked bring before us a large part of that problem. This important problem, the solution of which is of national significance, should be approached with no partisan bias, and no angry recriminations or denunciations should be tolerated. The spirit of the injunction, "Come, let us reason together," should be the spirit of approach.

We must clearly and sharply fasten in our minds the indisputable fact that, with respect to public utilities of the sort under discussion, we are confined to one of two alternatives. These alternatives are public control of private corporations, and public ownership with the public control which naturally springs from ownership. The experience of the entire civilized world has established the fact that we are restricted to these alternatives. We may have private street-railways, private gas-works, private water-works, etc., but in that case it is invariably and in the very nature of the case necessary to exercise public control over their operations. Charges must be regulated, general conditions of service must be prescribed, and regulation must be found for a thousand and one cases in which public and private interests touch each other. This is because, on the one hand, the nature of the service rendered is in such a peculiar

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

degree a public service, and also because the effective control of full and free competition is absent. We may, on the other hand, choose public ownership and management. We could, of course, separate public ownership from public management, and consider each one. In other words, we could have a publicly owned urban transportation system with private operation. Generally, public ownership and public management go together, and in the limited space at our disposal we will not undertake to separate them.

It is freely granted that either one of our two alternatives presents immense difficulties. This is a further point concerning which there can be no controversy among those who really understand the nature of the case. The evolution of industrial society has again brought us problems most difficult of solution. If we may use the language of design, history teaches us that Providence does not intend that men organized in society should have what we are always looking for in the future, namely, an easy-going time. Every age has its problems. In one age they may be brought by the inroads of barbarians, in another age by famine and pestilence, in another age by international wars. We have been dreaming of a coming time when no social problems should vex society; but, if history teaches us anything, it shows us that in such dreaming we are indulging in Utopian aspirations. Every civilization has been tested heretofore, and every civilization must have its test in the future, our own included. One of the tests of our civilization is the ability to solve the problem under discussion.

The question which confronts us is this: Which one of the two alternatives promises in the long run the best results?

Those who talk glibly about public control of those private corporations owning and operating public utilities frequently exhibit a sad ignorance of what their proposed remedy for existing evils means. They think in generalities, and do not reflect upon what control means in details. We have to observe, first of all, that public control of private corporations furnishing public utilities so-called means a necessary antagonism of interests in the civic household. Human nature is such that those who are to be controlled cannot be satisfied with the control exercised. However righteous the control may be, those who are controlled will frequently feel themselves aggrieved and wronged, and will try to escape the control. It is, furthermore, a necessary outcome of human nature that those persons who are to be controlled should

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enter politics in order that they may either escape the control, or shape it to their own ends. Again, we must remember what vast aggregations of men and capital it is proposed to control. The men owning and operating the corporations which furnish public utilities are numerous, and they maintain large armies of employees of all social grades, from the gifted and highly trained attorney to the unskilled laborer. The amount of capital involved in a great city is counted by tens of millions. The very nature of the case brings it about that there should be persistent, never-ceasing activity on the part of those to be controlled. The effort to escape from this control, or to shade it, is a part of the efforts by which men earn their livelihood, and their activity is as regular as their hunger. The efforts of patriotic and high-minded citizens, in their self-sacrificing neglect of their private affairs to look after public concerns, may grow weary, but not so the activity of the corporations to be controlled. Can a task of greater difficulty be well suggested? It is not said that the problem here presented is one which it is impossible for modern civilization to solve; but it is well that the general public should know precisely what it means. Some of us are to control others of us, and to do so against their will. But who are those whom we are asked to control? They are very frequently our friends and neighbors. I am asked to resist what is esteemed the extortion of a gas company; but one of the gas magnates may be my neighbor and friend, and occupy a pew next to mine in church. Perhaps the gas magnate is my employer. Perhaps he has just contributed, and with the best intent in the world, one hundred dollars to an object which I have greatly at heart. Perhaps I am a college professor, and the street-car magnate whose rapacity I am called upon to help hold in check has endowed the chair which I occupy. Imaginary illustrations can be continued indefinitely, and those who desire to do so can in any city make them sufficiently concrete. Is it strange that many of us who are called upon to control others of us should simply refuse to do it?

In so brief an article as this must be, it is possible to do little more than to throw out suggestions. It is noteworthy that in Massachusetts public control of corporations furnishing public utilities has been tried more persistently than anywhere else, and that in that State there is a stronger sentiment than anywhere else in the Union in favor of public ownership and public manage-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment. Serious charges have been brought against the Board of Gas and Electric Lighting Commissioners, which has to exercise control over gas and electric-lighting plants. Even a paper of the standing of the *Springfield Republican* has felt called upon to rebuke the board severely for keeping secret information which it has gathered. The attitude of the board is characterized as "extraordinary." "If the board," says the *Springfield Republican,* "is empowered to keep secret what information it is pleased to, how are the people to know that they may not become a mere agency of the monopolies to cover up and justify their possible undue exactions?" Insinuations of this kind are frequently heard in Massachusetts. Dismissing all charges of corruption and bad intention, we have as a net result a strong movement in Massachusetts, away from private ownership of public utilities, to public ownership.

The writer has followed this subject, and the trend of opinion with respect to it, for fifteen years with some care. In his own judgment the trend in favor of public ownership is marked and surprising. He has seen one investigator after another start with prepossessions in favor of public control of private corporations, and turn away from that position as a hopeless one, and take up a position in favor of public ownership as the only practicable solution under our American conditions. There lies before the writer a letter recently received from an attorney, a member of a well-known firm in one of our great cities. This lawyer has been forced by experience to abandon the position in favor of private ownership. He says, as the result of long-continued and self-sacrificing efforts to improve politics in his own city:

> "The alleged benefits of regulation are practically as impossible as an attempt to regulate the laws of gravitation, for our legislative councils are nominated, elected and controlled by forces too subtle and insidious to be attacked, and even to be known. * * * A community cannot regulate against millions of dollars organized to prevent it. This temptation disappears, however, when the municipality becomes the owner."

The difficulties of public ownership are not to be denied. They lie on the surface. The problem in the case of public ownership is to secure men of talent and experience to conduct these enterprises, and keep them in office during good behavior; to engage men for all positions on the basis of merit, and, while retaining vast armies of employees, to enact such legislation and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

administrative reforms as will prevent employees of the city, engaged in furnishing public utilities, from either using their political power for their own selfish ends, or from being used for partisan purposes. This implies, on the part of society, an appreciation of excellence of service, and a thorough-going reform of municipal civil service. Politicians of the baser sort, and all those who have selfish ends to be gained by political corruption, will work against such reform. On the other hand, public ownership with public operation presents the issues in a comparatively simple form. The clarification of issues is, indeed, one of the strong arguments in favor of municipal ownership. Who knows to what extent employees on the street railways of Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York and Chicago are appointed through the influence of politicians? It is known, however, that many appointments are made through the influence of politicians of precisely the worst sort. It is furthermore known that these corporations are now generally in politics. But because the corporations furnishing these public utilities are owners of private property, and because they conduct a business which is only quasi-public, the political corruption with which they are connected is hidden and obscure, and voters are confused and perplexed. Public ownership carries home to every one the importance of good government, and arrays on the side of good government the strong classes in a community now so often indifferent. Frequently men who are powerful in a community, in working for good government, work against, rather than for, their own private interests. It is, indeed, gratifying to see men of wealth, as frequently as they do, turn aside from selfish considerations to promote measures calculated to advance the general welfare. But can we expect this kind of conduct persistently from the great majority? Have we any right to expect it? A personal allusion is sufficiently instructive to warrant reference to it. When the writer had invested what was for him a considerable sum in gas stock, he tried to answer for himself this question: As an owner of gas stock, exactly what kind of a municipal government do I want? The government of the city in which was located the gas-works in which the writer was interested was a stench in the nostrils of reformers throughout the country; but he could not persuade himself that as an owner of gas stock any very considerable change was for his interest. The city government, as it then was, was a "safe" one, and the result of a change

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could not be foretold. Is not this, as a matter of fact, the solution of the problem which owners of stock in street railways, gas-works and similar enterprises generally reach when they look at municipal reform solely from the point of view of self-interest? And can we, then, be surprised at a certain apathy and indifference on the part of what are called the "better classes" in a community? Men of great wealth have been known to work directly against their own narrow interests for the public weal, but has an entire class of men ever been known to do this?

A further result of municipal ownership would be a better balance between private and public interests, and this better balance would strengthen the existing order against the attacks of socialists and anarchists, on the one hand, and unscrupulous plutocrats, on the other. A balance between private and public enterprise is what is fundamental in our present social order, and a disturbance of this balance consequently threatens this order. This balance is favorable to liberty, which is threatened when it is disturbed either in the one direction or the other. Any one who follows passing events with care cannot fail to see that it is menaced by socialism, on the one hand, and by plutocracy, on the other. A man of high standing in Philadelphia, himself a man of large wealth, when presiding at a public meeting recently, stated, practically in so many words, that a professor in a school of some note had lost his position on account of a monograph which he wrote in relation to the street railways of that city. This monograph was temperate in tone, and its scholarly character elicited commendation on all sides. We need not go into the merits of this particular case, but we cannot fail to notice disquieting rumors in regard to the attacks upon freedom of speech, which are an outcome of private ownership of public utilities. There is a widespread apprehension that the utterance of opinion upon one side promotes one's interest, and that the utterance of opinion upon the other side may prove damaging. Mathematical proof cannot be well adduced, but readers can, by careful observation, reach a conclusion as to the question whether or not our industrial order is menaced by plutocracy, always bearing in mind that plutocracy does not mean honestly gotten and honestly administered wealth. There are good rich men, and bad rich men, as there are good poor men, and bad poor men. Does private ownership of public utilities, on the one hand, tempt rich men to wrong

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

courses of action, and does it, on the other hand, place great power in the hands of unscrupulous wealth?

In an article restricted as the present is, it is impossible to go statistically into experience. The question may be raised, however, Has any one ever noticed an improvement in municipal government from a lessening of the functions of municipal government? Can any one point to a municipal government which has improved because its duties have been diminished, and the number of its employees lessened? If we turn away from local government, do we find that it is through the lessening of the function of government in general that an improvement is achieved? At one time, the Italian government operated the Italian railways. Later, it leased the railways to a private corporation. Has this retirement of Italy from the operation of the railways produced a regeneration in public life? As we travel over this country, and observe the course of local government, do we not, on the contrary, find that, on the whole, it has improved as its functions have increased, and as it appeals directly and effectively to larger and larger numbers? The case of England is a very clear one. If we go back fifty years, we shall probably find that the government of English cities was quite as bad as ours is now. During the past fifty years, there has been a continuous improvement, and this has accompanied continual expansion of municipal activity, while at the same time, through an extension of the suffrage, English municipal government has become increasingly democratic in character. We must hesitate about establishing a casual connection between these two movements, but is it unnatural to suppose that there may be such a connection? When there is a great deal at stake, when the city has much to do, good government of the cities appeals to all right-minded persons; and if there is no division of interests through private ownership, we ought, in a civilized community, to expect to find all honest and intelligent people working together for good government. A tangible basis is afforded the masses for an appeal for higher interests, and reliance is placed upon municipal self-help. Instead of asking other people to do things for them—namely, great private corporations—the people are told to help themselves.

Mistakes and wrong-doing must be anticipated under either one of our two possible systems. What about the relative serious-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ness of the mistakes and wrong-doing, however? We have a certain demoralization in each case, and a certain loss. While in the case of public ownership we have an opportunity to recover from mistaken action, in the case of private ownership mistaken and wrong action is often irretrievable in its consequences. Take the case of New York City as an illustration. Jacob Sharp secured a franchise for the Broadway surface railway through wholesale corruption, and was sent to the penitentiary. The franchise, however, was retained by those into whose hands it fell, and others have entered into the fruits of his theft. Under our American system of government, in cases of this sort stolen goods are retained. The franchises are retained, and the forgotten millions continue to suffer, because their rights have not been adequately safeguarded. With the other policy, namely, that of public ownership, how different would be the result? If the street railways were mismanaged, or their earnings stolen, it would be sufficient to turn out the municipal plunderers. Too many overlook what is distinctively American in our problem; namely, our constitutional system, which protects franchise grants when once made, and renders so irretrievable a mistaken policy, provided we have the system of private ownership.

Let it be distinctly understood that the position is not taken by the present writer in favor of municipal ownership at any and all times, and everywhere, and under all circumstances. It must come in the right way, it must come deliberately, and it must come provided with adequate safeguards. It must come as a part of other movements, especially of full civil service reform. But it is calculated in itself to promote these other reforms, and in some cases municipal ownership will be the first step in the direction of that full civil service reform which is so sadly needed. In some cases civilization may be in too low a condition to permit municipal ownership. The socialization of public sentiment which must lie back of proper social action may not have gone far enough. The question is: Have we the social man back of the social action which we advocate? If we are talking about the heart of Africa, with its individualistic blacks, unquestionably we have not the social man which would make possible any considerable amount of social action. Among barbarians and semi-civilized people the few must do things for the many. Social action must not be forced down from above, and it must not come

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accidentally, if it is to be successful. It must come as the result of full and free discussion, and of full and free expression on the part of the people. It is on this account that the initiative and referendum, in a country like ours, may properly accompany the social action. Have we in our own country the social man to back social action? If he does not everywhere exist, he is coming, and coming rapidly, and the amount of social action which the socialization of sentiment makes possible and desirable increases in proportion as he makes his appearance. The question of municipal ownership is a question of social psychology. It turns on the nature of the social mind.

RICHARD T. ELY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POSITIVISM: ITS POSITION, AIMS AND IDEALS.

BY FREDERIC HARRISON.

POSITIVISM is at once a philosophy, a polity, and a religion—all three harmonized by the idea of a supreme Humanity, all three concentrated on the good and progress of Humanity. This combination of man's whole thought, general activity, and profound feeling in one dominant Synthesis is the strength of Positivism, and at the same time an impediment to its rapid growth. The very nature of the Positivist scheme excludes the idea of wholesale conversion to its system, or of any sudden increase of its adherents. No philosophy before, no polity, no religion was ever so weighted and conditioned. Each stood alone on its special merit. Positivism only has sought to blend into coherent unity the three great forces of human life.

In the whole history of the human mind, no philosophy ever came bound up with a complete scheme of social organization, and also with a complete scheme of religious observance. Again, the history of religion presents no instance of a faith which was bound up with a vast scientific education, and also with a set of social institutions and political principles. Hitherto, all philosophies have been content to address man's reason and to deal with his knowledge, leaving politics, morality, industry, war, and worship open questions for other powers to decide. So, too, every religion has appealed directly to the emotions or the imagination, but has stood sublimely above terrestrial things and the passing cares of men. A mere philosophical idea, like Evolution, can sweep across the trained world in a generation, and is accepted by the masses when men of learning are agreed. A practical movement, such as Reform, Self-government, Socialism, or Empire, catches hold of thousands by offering immediate material profit. Men of any creed, of any opinion, can join in the definite point.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This has given vogue to so many systems of thought, so many political nostrums, such a variety of religious revivals. It has also been the cause of their ultimate failure, however great their temporary success. They have been one-sided, partial, mutually destructive. A religion which ignores science finds itself at last undermined and discredited by facts. A polity which has no root in history and in the science of human nature, ends in confusion, like the Social Contract or the Rights of Man. And a philosophy which is too lofty to teach men how to live, or what to worship, is flung aside by the passions, emotions, interests of busy men.

Positivism insists that the cause of all these failures has been the attempt to treat human nature in sections and by special movements, whereas human nature is an organic whole and can only be treated as an organism of infinite cohesion. Positivism is the first attempt to appeal to human nature *synthetically*—that is, to regard man as equally a logical being, a practical being, and a religious being, so that his thought, his energy, his devotion may all coincide in the same object. The Christian preacher may cry aloud that this object is God and Salvation. But when he is asked to explain the relation of Salvation to Conic Sections or to Home Rule, his answers are vague. The Agnostic philosopher, again, assures us that this centre of thought is Evolution; but how the devout soul is to worship Evolution, or how the workman is to better his lot by Evolution, are problems which the Agnostic philosopher finds troublesome and idle. The Radical Reformer insists on a brand-new set of institutions, and trusts that men's beliefs, habits, desires, yearnings and religions will soon settle themselves. But this is the last thing they ever do. Hitherto all philosophies, all polities, all religions have sought to treat human nature as a quack who should treat a sick man, on the assumption that he had no brain, or that his nerves were of steel, or that his stomach was to be ignored. They have had successes, as nostrums do have. The Positive Synthesis, for the first time, provides the harmony for thought, activity and feeling. But, since almost the whole of our real knowledge is limited to this planet, and certainly the whole of what we can do is so limited, and since our best aspirations and ideals are human (or, at least, anthropomorphic), it follows that any true Synthesis of human nature as a whole must centre in Humanity. That is the key to the power of Positivism, and also to its very gradual advance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That which is nothing unless it be comprehensive, systematic, synthetic, naturally finds arrayed against it the popular currents of the hour. There never was an age so deeply intoxicated with specialism in all its forms as our own, so loftily abhorrent of anything systematic, so alien to *synthesis*, that is, organic coördination of related factors. Everything nowadays is treated in infinitesimal subdivisions. Each biologist sticks to his own microbe; each historian to his own "period"; the practical man leaves "ideas" to the doctrinaire, and the divine leaves it to the dead worldling to bury his dead in his own fashion. Specialism is erected into a philosophy, a creed, a moral duty, an intellectual antiseptic. It is this dispersive habit which makes our art so mechanical, our religion so superficial, our philosophy so unstable, and our politics so chaotic. A movement, of which the first aim is to stem the torrent of this dispersiveness, naturally finds welcome only with those whom our moral, material and mental anarchy has profoundly saddened and alarmed.

Positivism, then, so far as it is a religion, does not seek to be accepted on impulse, or by rapture, under a gush of devotional excitement. When Peter preached, "Repent and be baptized, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost!" the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. But Saint Peter cared little for science or philosophy, and even less for politics and art. Positivism asks to be accepted as the result of a great body of convergent convictions, or not to be accepted at all. Being a religion, it is not a thing to be decided by the authority of the learned. Every brain must reason it out for itself; every heart must feel its enthusiasm; every character must resolve to live and die by it in daily life. It is not like a political movement which aims at forming a party, a militant league, or a revolution. It never appeals to the instinct of combat; it inflames no passion of self-interest; it panders not to the spirit of destruction, to the spirit of equality, or the love of mockery and satire. It offers nothing immediate, no panacea to make every one blissful, or rich, or wise. It insists that all reforms must be gradual, complicated, spiritual and moral, not material and legislative. It discourages all immediate and direct remedies for social and political maladies, and ever preaches the humble and difficult method of progress by mental education and moral regeneration. Now, those reformers who are ready to sacrifice all their impatient

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hopes, all royal roads to the millennium, all revolutionary dreams for establishing Utopia, such spirits are few and rare.

The problem before Positivism is threefold; each side being practically equal in importance and also in difficulty. It seeks to transfer religion from a supernatural to a scientific basis, from a theological to a human creed; to substitute in philosophy a relative anthropo-centric synthesis for an absolute, cosmical analysis; to subordinate politics, both national and international, to morality and religion. No doubt, in these three tasks the religion is the dominant element. The change in its meaning and scope is the most crucial in the history of human civilization. The change involves two aspects, at first sight incompatible and even contradictory. The one involves the surrender of the supernatural and theological mode of thought; the other is the revival, or rather the amplification, of the religious tone of mind.

Positivism, thus, with one hand, has to carry to its furthest limits that abandonment of the supernatural and theological field which marks the last hundred years of modern thought, and yet, with the other hand, it has to stem the tide of materialism and anti-religious passion, and to assert for religion a far larger part than it ever had, even in the ages of theocracy and sacerdotalism. The vulgar taunt that Positivism is anti-religious arises from ignorance. The constant complaint of Positivism is that religion, in all its Neo-Christian phases, has shrunk into a barren formula. The essence of Positivism is to make religion permeate every human action, thought and emotion. And the idea of humanity alone can do this. Deity cannot say, "*Nihil humani a me alienum.*" Humanity can and does say this; whereas, in logic, the formula of theology—the formula in which it glories—is "*Omne humanum a me alienum.*" Omnipotence, as such, can have no concern with the Binomial Theorem, or a comedy of Molière, or female suffrage, or old-age pensions, or a Wagner opera—that is, with ninety-nine parts of human life and interest. The result is that theological religion has less and less to do with human life. If religion is ever to be supreme, it must be anthropo-centric.

But, on the other hand, an age, so ardently materialist and scientific as our own, is antipathetic to the idea of religion presuming to interfere at all. The ordinary agnostic or sceptic, if he abstains in public from Voltairean mockery, systematically treats religion, even the religious tendency or tone of mind, as an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amiable weakness and negligible quantity. He is little concerned to attack it, for he finds it every day more willing to get out of his way, and to wrap itself up in transcendental generalities. This is the temper which Positivism has to subdue. But it finds the scientific and positive minds scandalized at the suggestion of any revival of religion, whilst the religious world is scandalized by the repudiation of theology. A movement, having aims apparently so little reconcilable, can only find prepared minds here and there to accept it. Yet its strength lies in this: it is the only possible reconciliation of two indestructible tendencies, equally deep-rooted in the human mind—the craving for the assurance of demonstrable realities, and the craving for faith and devotion as the supreme control of human life.

This summary sketch of the Positivist Synthesis of Thought, Feeling and Life is not intended as any explanation of it—an elaborate volume could not give room for that—but as a mere preliminary to dealing with the question I am asked to answer: What are the present position, aims and expectations of Positivism?

Well! Auguste Comte, the founder of Positivism, a professor at the *École Polytechnique,* died in Paris about forty-three years ago, having put forth his system of philosophy about sixty years ago, and having completed his system of Polity and Religion about forty-five years ago. There are now organized bodies of men, holding and teaching these ideas, in most of the parts of Europe and also of the Transatlantic continent. Speaking for England, for which only I am entitled to speak, the English groups, not very numerous bodies in London and in five or six principal towns, prefer to present the Positivist Synthesis in somewhat different aspects, but do not disagree in any essential principle. Some of these groups choose to insist on the strictly religious side of the Positivist scheme, regarding it as a Church in the ordinary sense of the term, and attempting to put into ceremonial practice the cult described in the fourth volume of Comte's *"Politique."* This neither Comte himself ever did, nor has his direct successor and principal disciple done so, nor have Comte's own personal friends in France. Without passing any opinion upon the ultimate realization of what, for my own part, I regard as a striking and interesting Utopia, neither I nor my colleagues in the English Positivist Committee have felt either

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the time to be ripe for any such undertaking, nor the development of our movement to be adequate to make any attempt of the kind practical or serious. The attempt has led in South America to some farcical egotism, and the experiment elsewhere has led to no encouraging result. Personally, I have no wish to see the pontifical method carried any further, and it has little interest for me.

For my own part, from the formation by Comte's successor in Paris of the English Positivist Committee, of which I have been president for twenty years, I have always opposed everything that could tend to form "a sect." By "sect," I mean the Pharisaical separation of a body of persons from their fellow-citizens, valuing themselves on certain special observances, and living an exclusive life of their own. All this is to us so abhorrent that we would rather run the risk of becoming too easy than of becoming narrow sectaries. Accordingly, we have been, from the first, of the world and in the world around us; having no shibboleths, no creeds, no tests of orthodoxy, not even any roll of membership. We have always been ready to work with all humane movements of a kindred sort. We have no priests, no recognized form of worship, no ritual, and no special canon of adhesion. They who choose to come amongst us to follow our lectures, or to discuss our views, are welcome to come. Those who help on the work, by labor or by gifts in money or in kind, are of us and with us, so long as it pleases them to continue such co-operation.

Everything about our work is voluntary, gratuitous, open. Newton Hall is, first and foremost, a Free School; on its notices is written: "All meetings and lectures free." Nothing is paid to those who lecture, or demanded from those who attend. No questions are asked, no collection is made, no seats are paid for or reserved. Those who choose to subscribe can do so, without giving any pledge, and withdraw when they choose to withdraw. Lectures in science, in history, in languages, in art, even musical training and classical concerts, have all been free and public. And tens of thousands of men and women have been present from time to time, who would decline to call themselves Positivists, and who might at the time feel little more than sympathy and interest. The aim of our body has been to form a school of thought, not to found a sect; to influence current opinion, not to enroll members of a party; to uphold an ideal of religion which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should rest on positive science whilst permeating active life. It is an idle question to ask, "What are the numbers, or the machinery, of such a body?"

Newton Hall, opposite the Public Record Office, in London, has now been open nearly twenty years. It was so named because it stands on the ground purchased for the Royal Society by Sir Isaac Newton, its president, in 1710; and, during the eighteenth century, the Hall, built thereon by the Royal Society for its collections, contained the first nucleus of the British Museum. There public, free lectures on Positivist philosophy, science, morality and religion have been carried on continually during autumn, winter and spring, together with classes for the study of mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, history, languages and music. The greater names in the Positivist Calendar of 558 Worthies of all ages and nations have been commemorated on special centenaries, those of musicians by appropriate musical pieces. In the summer months, these lectures have been extended in the form of pilgrimages to the birthplace, tomb, or residence of the illustrious dead, and lectures at the public museums, galleries and ancient monuments. In connection with Newton Hall, there have been social parties, libraries and Guilds of young men and young women. So far, the work of the Positivist body in London has been that of a Free School and People's Institute.

It may be asked, In what way does such a Free School differ from many other similar institutions? The answer is in the fact that the entire scheme of education given in Newton Hall is *synthetic* and *organic*—concentrated on the propaganda of the Positive Philosophy and the Religion of Humanity. Leaving it to other movements to promote miscellaneous information and promiscuous culture of a general kind, the aim of all Positivist teaching is to inculcate the cardinal doctrines of the Positive belief, the central principles of Positive morality, and the vital sense of the Human Religion. In the first Report issued from Newton Hall, for 1881, we said:

"The very existence of Positivism as a scientific system of belief depends on the institution of a complete course of education, and the formation of an adequate body of competent teachers. There is, on positive principles, no road to stable religious convictions except by the way of knowledge of real things; and there is no royal road to real knowledge other than the teaching of competent instructors and the systematic study of science in the widest sense. One of the pur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poses for which Newton Hall has been opened is to offer free popular training in the essential elements of scientific knowledge. Our plan is but one of the many attempts around us to found a People's School. It differs from almost all of these in the following things:

"1. It will be on principle strictly free; no teacher being paid, and no fee being received.

"2. The education aimed at, not being either professional or literary, will follow the scheme of scientific instruction laid down for the future by Auguste Comte.

"3. Whilst having no theological or metaphysical element, the entire course of study will aim at a religious, that is, a social purpose, as enabling us to effect our due service to the cause of Humanity, by understanding the laws which regulate the world and our own material and moral being."

In pursuance of this scheme of education, courses of lectures have been given by graduates of the universities, most of them having been professors, examiners, and lecturers in various sciences, arts or history. The courses have been followed, in many cases, during the whole of that period, and many of the students have obtained a solid general education, especially in the various branches of history, biography and political philosophy. It is not pretended that this has been done by any large numbers. Other institutions of the kind have enjoyed much greater resources and have attracted far more numerous attendants. The reason is obvious. For one man who has the patience or the thoughtfulness to put himself under the curriculum of a laborious training, for the sole end of obtaining an intellectual and moral guidance in a definite system, there are always ninety-nine who are ready to pick up any desultory, entertaining or marketable knowledge which may be offered to them without too much mental discipline or any distinctive labels. To enter a Positivist Hall, much less to join a Positivist class, or to subscribe to a Positivist fund, requires in these days of prejudice and lampooning, a certain mental detachment and a real moral courage. The direct object of our courses is to inculcate Positive convictions with a view to a Positivist life. And as the public which is prepared to accept these terms is as yet not numerous, our hearers must be rather described as "fit, though few."

If the formation of coherent Positivist convictions by a scientific education be the first task of such a movement, it is far from being the sole task. The control of all action, whether political, economic, or international, by moral judgment is a cardinal duty imposed on Positivists in all places and at all times. Ac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cordingly, for forty years English Positivists have ardently supported the just claims of Labor against the oppression of Capitalism, the just demand of the People to full incorporation in the State, which exists mainly for the use and improvement of the People; they have maintained the just demand of the Irish nation to be recognized as an indestructible national unit; they have protested against a series of unjust wars and the incessant efforts of British Imperialism to crush out one independent race after another. All this is no recent thing. Forty years ago, the founders of the Positivist group in England began to take public action on behalf of the organized Trades Unions. In 1867 the Positivist Society appealed to Parliament through Mr. John Bright, M. P., on behalf of the Irish Nationalists; and they have never ceased to uphold the same cause. In 1881 they appealed to the Government to recognize the full independence of the Transvaal Republic. And to-day they are the first to insist on the same policy as that of Justice and Honor.

There has never been an unjust annexation or a wanton war in Europe, Asia or Africa within the last thirty years, when the Positivist body has not raised its voice to plead for morality and justice, regardless of the popular cry for Empire and malignant sneers at "Little Englandism." The record of these efforts may be seen in the "Essays" of Dr. R. Congreve, the first to form a Positivist body in England; in the "Positivist Comments on Public Affairs, 1878-1892;" and, from 1893 to 1900, in the eight volumes of the *Positivist Review*. In an article on the "Positivist Comments" I wrote:

> "The Positivist Society has no reason to shrink from a review of its policy over this period under five different administrations. It is a policy independent of party: national, patriotic, and devoid of any petty or factious criticism. Its sole aim is to plead for the real honor and good of England, in the interest of peace, the harmony of nations, respect for other races, religions, and honorable ambitions, and mainly for the cause of general civilization."

These "Comments," over fourteen years, I said:

> "Embody a coherent and systematic policy dealing with England's international relations as a whole, and weighing the ultimate and indirect effect of each proposed action as affecting the peace of the world and the true cause of civilization. It is not a policy of peace-at-any-price, nor of a little-England, nor of uninstructed sentiment, nor of any prejudice of creed, or race, much less of party, of democratic faction, or mischief-making. It is a policy that considers the ***past,***

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and still more the *future*, and not merely the *present*—a policy that respects the rights and dignity of other nations as much as our own."*

Of course, such a policy as this, publicly pursued in times of intense social and political excitement, could not fail to strain the cohesion of the Positivist propaganda and to limit its progress. Bound by our most sacred principles to uphold definite views of national and international morality, we could not fail to encounter the prejudices of party, of class, of race, of patriotism, in their hours of keenest heat. Though resolutely abstaining from any party entanglement and from any criticism of practical applications of principle, it was in the last degree difficult to prevent some divergences of view, and impossible not to drive away thousands of those who were otherwise disposed to join. No system of thought, no economic scheme, certainly no religious movement, ever had to meet such inherent obstacles to acceptance. A philosophy appeals to thought, but it does not meddle with angry political debates. The social reformer has his own difficulties, but he does not rouse up the passions of politicians, party and journalism. The religious reformer renders unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and is absorbed in the higher interests of the Soul and its Salvation. But Positivism, because it is a Polity, as much as it is a Philosophy and a Religion, is continually forced to face the most angry storms of popular delirium and of political passion. And never so much as to-day.

Lastly, the distinctive aim of Positivism is to promulgate the conception of a real religion based on positive science. No religion can be stable or dominant, if it rests on hypotheses and aspirations, which are necessarily dreamy and in constant flux. If religion, in our age of realities, is to be based on acknowledged proofs, its object must be earthly and human. The Supreme Power, dominant on earth and over man, of which we have scientific knowledge is Humanity. And the ideal of Positivism is gradually to form the sense of a religion of Humanity.

And this is, also, the main difficulty that Positivism has to overcome. Denouncing, as it does, the insolent folly of Atheism, and also the arid nullity of Agnosticism, it is yet difficult to convince the religious minded that Positivism can be anything but a new attack on Christianity and on Theism. Comte said: "The atheist is the most irrational of all theologians, for he gives the

* Positive Review, Vol. IV., 73.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

least admissible answer to the insoluble problem of the Universe." Neither in open controversy, nor in private meditation, does the true Positivist hold the belief that the Infinite All came about by chance or made itself. But the orthodox controversialist perversely confounds him with those who do hold the atheistic creed, and this becomes the source of rooted antipathy and prejudice. The Positivist neither denies Creation with the atheist, nor is he satisfied, with the agnostic, to boast that he knows nothing as to the religious problem. He simply says that, whatever higher paths may yet be known, the historic conception of Humanity and its practical providence offers all the essential elements of a religious faith.

This does not satisfy the Theist, and the forms of Theism are infinitely vague, indefinite, mystical, or even verbal, almost as numerous as the individual theists. A well-known man of letters thus summed up his creed: "He fancied there was a sort of a something!" Any of us might say that, and not find it a working religion. It is the very definiteness, the undeniable reality of Humanity, its close touch upon every phase of human life, that repels so many anxious wanderers in the limitless wilderness of Theology. In these days of shallow spiritualism, the weaker brethren will cling to anything that is cloudy, unintelligible, transcendental. And their practical Gods are Mammon and Moloch.

Much less is Positivism an attack on Christianity. It is the rational development of Christianity, its incorporation with science and philosophy. Not, certainly, with the miraculous and supernatural dogmas of Christendom, but with the humanity of the Gospel in its spiritual ideal, and the moral and social ideals of the Christian churches. No doubt, the Christian ideal is but a fractional part of the Positivist ideal, just as the Christian ideal is only in touch with a fractional part of human nature and man's life on earth. But so far as this Christian ideal is honestly human, and essentially permanent, Positivism is destined to give it a vast development. But this is not enough for those who still hanker after the Athanasian Creed or the Westminster Confession, or even some more inscrutable label.

The human type of religion must radically differ from the theological type, for it can have nothing of the violent, ecstatic, sensational character which is inherent in Monotheism. Positiv-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ism is an adult and mature phase of religion, primarily addressed to adults, to men and women of formed character and trained understanding. It is a manly and womanly religion, full of manly and womanly associations and duties. Hence, it must grow gradually, work equally, and be marked by endurance, reserve, good sense, completeness, more than by passion, fanaticism and ecstatic self-abandonment. When they ask us: Where are the tremendous sanctions, spasmodic beatitudes, penances, raptures, beatific visions and transcendant mysteries of Christianity? we can only smile. These things belong to the childhood of man, the fairy tale of religion. The "customs" of Dahomey, the sacrifices of Polytheism and Mosaism disgust the maturity of man. And so Christianity will never satisfy the later ages of civilization, until it is rational from top to bottom, co-extensive with human life, and in close touch with our latest culture and all forms of healthy manliness and womanliness. Religion is not to be forever nourished by mere hysterical emotions, and vague yearnings for what we cannot rationally conceive.

Religion, so reconstituted, will lose much of its rapturous and ecstatic character. It will gain in solidity, constancy and breadth. Instead of being a thing of transcendental hopes and fears, stimulated on Sundays and occasional moments, but laid aside, if not doubted, for the rest of man's active time, religion will be a body of scientific convictions, poetic emotions, and moral habits, in close relation with all our thoughts, acts and feelings, and naturally applying to everything we do, or desire, or think. It will be part of the citizen's daily life: more social than personal, more civic than domestic, more practical than mystical. It will give ample scope to the personal, the domestic, even the mystical side of human nature, within the control of reason and the claims of active duty. Religion will thus mean the guidance of right living by the light of personal and social duty as taught by a systematic Sociology. Its creed will be a synthetic Philosophy, resting on the general body of positive science. And its worship will be the expression of loyalty to Humanity in all its phases, as manifested in its true servants, the known or the unknown, the living or the dead, of all ages and of every race.

FREDERIC HARRISON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RECENT DRAMATIC SEASON.

BY W. D. HOWELLS.

It has been so long the habit of criticism to regard the theatre as in a hopeless decay, that one has first to make one's peace with one's prejudice and then with one's public, before venturing to say that, during the past season, there have been seven or eight new plays given in New York worthy of the heyday of the English drama. Whether this means something worthy of

"The spacious times of great Elizabeth,"

or those of the second Charles, or the third George, or the fourth William, I would rather let the reader decide. It is enough for me to launch my faith in air, without attempting to limit or direct it.

I.

The season has not been exceptional in being somewhat peculiar. There have been no such signal productions as that of "The Notorious Mrs. Ebbsmith," or "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray," or "The Case of Rebellious Susan," or "The Manoeuvres of Jane," among the London importations, and among the American pieces there has been nothing so fresh or surprising as some things hitherto done in the native drama. But I have seen four good American plays, and four English plays so much better that my patriotic pride in the first has been chastened to impartial pleasure by a sense of the superiority of the last.

It is, in fact, quite useless for us to contest this superiority of the English playwrights. Somehow, they have got there, while our dramatists are still only more or less well on the way. They seem to have got there, too, in spite of making their plays such good literature that one likes to read them as well as see them. This is true not only of the work of brilliant wits like Mr. George

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bernard Shaw, who confessedly writes too well for the stage, but whose "Arms and the Man" is almost the best comedy on it; and poor Oscar Wilde, who did things almost as fine from a humor almost as rich and daring; but it is true, also, of such tempered geniuses as Mr. Pinero and Mr. Henry Arthur Jones and Mr. R. C. Carton and Mr. R. Marshall. In the work of all these you taste the literary quality as you taste it in the plays of Goldsmith and Goldoni, of Molière and Sheridan, of Björnsen and Ibsen, of Hauptmann and Sudermann, of Echegaray and Estebanez. The like can be said of no American playwright that I know of except Mr. Augustus Thomas, some of whose printed dramas I have read with the sort of enjoyment they give me in the theatre. But for the rest, our dramatists seem to be submissive to the impudent assumption of the theatre that a play cannot be good if it is literary, or other than the worse for its literature. There is, consequently, so little literature in them that one is left to wonder why they are not indefinitely greater dramatists; they ought logically to be something super-Shakespearean; for Shakespeare's plays are much more literary than any of theirs.

II.

In speaking of the dramatic season I do not primarily concern myself with the acting. That has nothing to do, of course, with the goodness or badness of the plays. If it is bad it cannot spoil the plays; if it is never so good it cannot impart excellence to them. It is a thing apart and a subordinate affair; though it can give such exquisite joy if it truly interprets a true thing. All that I have to say of it is what I have several times said before; the playing is commonly better than the plays. This is true even of the uneven playing of the American companies; and it is only not true of the playing of such an English company as Mr. John Hare's in "The Gay Lord Quex"; there the play was best, though the playing was of a refined perfection that none of the American playing could rival. I do not know, but it seems to me that the histrionic art has degenerated in American hands through the necessity of being so English. An American actor or actress conforming to the London standard of tone and accent, is as obviously acting as an American "club man" or "society woman" trying to do the same thing. At the same time, I do not see what else they are to do; and I remark upon their disability

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without proposing a different ideal. It results in something so strange to both the English and American utterance that it suggests the despair of exile without the hope of naturalization. One feels it most acutely as a remembered ache in listening to an English company like Mr. Hare's (if there is any other like that), and feeling the perfect charm of those trained English voices in those English inflections which our actors on or off the stage parody so ineffectually. Next to this pleasure, which is such a very great one, is the pleasure of hearing the pure American note in its variety, as we get it in Mr. Herne's "Sag Harbor," or Mr. Thomas's "Arizona." I could fancy English people delighting in that; but they would have to be English people of more delicate perceptions than most of their race to be able to recognize the perfection of the New York note, moral as well as vocal, in the first act of Mr. Clyde Fitch's comedy, "The Climbers."

To be done with the theatre as soon as possible and get on to the drama, one must put Mr. Richard Mansfield's "Henry V." behind one at once. It was better than one could have hoped, since it was the Shakespeare history shaped to a point and used for the constant conspicuity of the actor; that is, there was more Shakespeare and less Mr. Mansfield, though there was always a good deal of Mr. Mansfield, and in one supreme spectacular passage there was nothing of Shakespeare. But it was never such a triumph for the actor over the author as Mme. Bernhardt's "Hamlet," which, in that way, was quite the greatest triumph possible. One did not think of Shakespeare at all; one thought only of Mme. Bernhardt. Yet she is artist enough to have wished the poet's supposition that Hamlet was a man of rich fancy, of tender if troubled spirit, and of most endearing sorrow to have some weight with the spectator so that one should not go away thinking him an elderly woman, harsh, hard, noisy and restless.

I did not see her in *"L'Aiglon";* Miss Maude Adams in one act of that play had given me all of it that I could bear; and after the "Hamlet" of Mme. Bernhardt, I perceived that I could have lost little in not having tried to imagine her a still younger man. In fact, the "Cyrano de Bergerac" of M. Rostand was more than enough, false as it was in every moment and motive of the preposterous fable devoted to making one believe that a man of decent conscience, not to say of brilliant intellect, could hoodwink the woman he loved into marriage with a stupid dolt.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After seeing that, I was quite willing to let any one that liked think M. Rostand another Shakespeare; but I was not willing to see an exquisite talent like M. Coquelin debased to the uses of such tawdry melodrama. After Coquelin in Molière, I did not want Coquelin in Rostand.

III.

Perhaps I was the more sensitively reluctant, because I had already had Mr. John Drew in "Richard Carvel." That play is, of course, worse than the novel of the name, and the novel itself is better than the other historical romances, which, it was easy to foresee, would soon get out of their covers and expose their spiritual and intellectual nakedness on the stage. But, with the warning of that play before me, I excused myself the more readily from witnessing the other plays made from the other historical romances. I cannot justly, therefore, condemn them, and if any one were to say that they were as good as the novels they were made from, or better, I could believe him.

I did not feel the same apprehension of a fine actor's humiliation in "David Harum;" not because Mr. Crane is not a fine actor, but because "David Harum" is an indefinitely better book than the other great commercial successes. It is, in all that relates to Harum on his simple horse-trading and country banking level, a very true and a very good book. It is when it attempts to rise from this level, and soar in the fine air of sudden benefactions to insolvent widowhood, that it betrays the perfunctory motive of a flying machine. The dramatist, however, felt obliged not only to emphasize this sorry performance, but to add a factitious motive of his own in a heroine who tests the moral quality of Harum by various experiments, in order to marry his protegé when Harum proves pure gold. In spite of this, the play is very amusing, and finds a true climax in the triumph of Harum over the Deacon in a horse-trade. The spectators who bore the sentiment patiently, and probably, poor souls, thought they liked it, roared with joy in the comedy, which was really funny. They had the curtain up again and again on the Deacon trying to start the balky mare in a pouring rain. They could not get enough of that.

It was a simple pleasure, from a very elementary source, but it was genuine, and in that it was akin to such pleasure as the false motive of "Sag Harbor" allowed one to get from its true charac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terization. The motive was the tattered superstition that a woman may, can, will, or ever did marry the man she does not love and refuse the man she does love, because the man she does not love has been good to her, and loves her, and will be broken-hearted if she does not marry him. Of course, it is strictly her sole business, and her supreme duty to marry the man she loves, unless he is an unreformed drunkard. Any other marriage is treason to her nature and a pollution of her womanhood; and Mr. Herne, having made his heroine commit this sin, is employed through the rest of the play in trying to trammel up the consequence. Of course, he can only pretend that she had chosen the best man and done the best thing, after all; but nobody believes this, even when she says it. Less than ever one believes it then, for the poor falsehood is the culmination of the falsehood by which the character continually perishes in the play. The pity was the greater because it was Miss Julie Herne, a most delicately conscientious and pleasing young artist, whose endeavor to put truth into a part incapable of it was a long defeat throughout. Her pretty and winning art failed of any effect comparable to that made by Miss Chrystal Herne, in a single moment of honest comedy, when she tries to have the young man of her choice realize that he is in love with her, and say so. Mr. Herne himself, who is after Jefferson the best American actor living, could not put reality into an action essentially disabled from the beginning, though he brought to the task all the beautiful naturalness of his mimetic skill, and all his ingenuity as a playwright. The author of "Margaret Fleming," of "Shore Acres," and of "Griffith Davenport," cannot be named by the critic without a sense of his rare dramatic gift; but this was not equal to the impossibility which he had attempted in "Sag Harbor." The characterization, both by author and actor, was admirable, but you could not believe what either said. In minor points the play was faultless; and, when one could forget the monstrous fib at its heart, one was, if a lover of life, happy in moments of most courageous fidelity to nature, in touches of pure comedy, native in its fineness as well as its grotesqueness.

IV.

If Mr. Thomas could have marked more distinctly his own sense of the fallacious sentimentality which actuates the hero of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his "Arizona," he would have saved me from much the same discomfort I suffered in seeing "Sag Harbor." But, apparently, he could not find the moment to take that mistaken young man aside and say to him, in the hearing of the audience, "Now, go on if you must, and sacrifice your good name to save from public dishonor a woman who has dishonored herself by consenting to leave her husband for her lover. Be scorned by her husband as a thief; suffer yourself to be forced out of the army; break the hearts of your friends who see in you the disgrace you will not explain; put to cruel and senseless proof the faith of the good girl who loves you; do all this, if you will, because you are a young, romantic ass; but don't expect me to back you. Any one else would see that this woman who has allowed her heart to be turned from her husband because she finds army-post life dull and has no amusement but flirting, is a fool and worse, and not worth saving from the shame she has consented to at the cost of any shame to others; she is spoiled and lost already, for it is not the adultery, but the adulterous heart that counts in these things. Instead of 'saving' her, by throwing dust in her husband's eyes—for that is what it comes to—do the straight, honest, manly thing. Tell the truth; say that you have stopped her from eloping, and that you took from her lover the jewels found on you with a purpose of safeguarding them, and so make me a situation worthy of my skill. *Don't* load me up with another stage hero, when I am looking for a *real* hero; give *me* a chance, and I will make your reputation."

Probably the young man would have denied any such appeal, but Mr. Thomas would at least have washed his hands of him, if he had made the audience understand that he had no sympathy with his self-sacrifice. It seems not so central, so pivotal, so structural (or destructural), somehow, as the self-sacrifice of the heroine in "Sag Harbor," though I should be puzzled to say why it does not seem so. It may be because it is postulated of that military life which is the negation of the ideals of the civil life. What is certain is that the situation gains in possibility (not to go so far as to say probability) by being imagined of army people, and after a good deal of war drama one still finds a refreshing novelty in Mr. Thomas's pictures of army-post life in Arizona. The sense of being in safe hands with regard to the lesser as well as larger facts enhances the comfort of the spectator, and one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thrills in the exciting effects with the conviction that one's thrills are fully authorized. The dramatist has mastered his material so thoroughly that one has a pleasure in the details of his action, such as one feels in the authenticities of, say, "The Gay Lord Quex." In both plays the same sort of exhaustive and scrupulous æsthetic conscience has been at work, and the same sort of keen and alert intelligence. The result is a restful evenness in the composition which the nerves can feel better than the words can say. In the "Arizona" one had not a moment's fear that the dramatist did not know the road he had taken, or that the passengers would have to get out anywhere and walk.

The American atmosphere in such dramas as we have produced is of the thin clearness of the atmosphere which wraps our portion of the planet; and in "Arizona" it lacks even such mellowness as softens the outlines of personality in "Sag Harbor" and other creations of the home-keeping invention of our playwrights. In its intense distinctness the local color has a peculiar charm; the picturesqueness of the life is extraordinarily vivid, and there is no shadow of uncertainty in the action; it is sharp and rapid, as if it were the nervous response of human nature keyed to sympathy with the moistureless air of the region, and unclogged by the vapors of misgiving that burden it in other climes. In the whole *entourage* there is the fascination of something old, something Oriental, as if the far West had got beyond itself in the farthest East. Whenever we part company with the army people, and find ourselves amidst the mixed population of the Arizona ranch where the scene mostly passes, it is with a sort of dream-like bewilderment in the encounter of such types as the old, over-drinking, raucous, bragging, joking rancher and his wife, who bully each other and threaten and then give way, and are really always good friends in spite of themselves. The plot is closely wrought, and vigorously operated, with its sort of threefold movement in the several affairs of the Colonel and his fool wife, of the hero who sacrifices himself for her and is in love with her sister, and of the young Mexican who sees no reason against marrying a girl in the fact that her trust has been abused by another, and who resents the obtrusion of the fact upon his knowledge as a sort of disgusting impertinence. The weak point in the piece is the hero's self-sacrifice, and that seems rather his fault than the author's.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

V.

If he had been older he would have known what a very old convention it was, but in "The Climbers" I do not know how young the people ought to have been not to realize the remote antiquity of the convention that took the life out of that piece, otherwise so promising and so amusing. The situation of the lover of another man's wife uniting with her in the recognition and renunciation of their passion was invented so long before the discovery of America, and is so distinctly proper to pre-historic conditions, that it never seems otherwise than alien when predicated of our society; yet it was this decrepit tradition which Mr. Clyde Fitch asked us to be content with, after giving us a passage of as fresh and native comedy as I have seen on our stage. In fact, a certain essence of New York has never been so perfectly expressed as in that encounter between the two "society women," on the one side, and the bereaved mother and daughter on the other, whom they visit the day of the husband's and father's funeral, to be first in bidding for the new Paris dresses which their sudden bereavement must prohibit the widow and orphan wearing. The play is worth while if for nothing but that scene, in which the incomparable worldliness, the indecent hardness, breaking at times through the shell of their decorums, and at all times palpable under them, represents in these women the spirit of the most commercialized society in the world. It is a great thing to have done, and the author is not to be blamed if he could not keep its level throughout. He is to be blamed, however, for not feeling that in such light work lay his example and his value. It was light, but not superficial; it was deeply and really tragical; whereas his apparent tragedy was superficial and really ridiculous. The tawdry wife and her tawdry lover were only less tawdry than her dishonest and defaulting husband, who did not essentially differ from her in a certain shamelessly selfish ideal of personal happiness.

In "Unleavened Bread" this ideal was ultimated and illustrated with a kind of final ugliness in the character of Selma, as it was dramatized from Mr. Robert Grant's novel. The dramatization was one of the best I have seen from a novel, and I thought it almost the best American play of the winter. It certainly was the freshest in the variety of its material, as Selma

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

herself has been the latest revelation in American character. I do not say that it had the strong dramatic movement of "Arizona" or the comic charm of "Sag Harbor," but it was more firmly based, more truly structural than either in the verity of its motive.

Its motive was simply the sort of insensible selfishness which appears oftener or more notably in women than in men, and renders them the monsters they can never see themselves. From her first consciousness, Selma Babcock, or Littleton, or Lyons (for in her successive marriages she is all three), has had no thought but for herself, and no principle but a pitiless personal ambition, which she mistakes for several finer things, especially for "true Americanism," especially when she is snubbed in her society aspirations. Her second marriage brings her to New York from the West, where she has ruthlessly, but justly enough, divorced her first husband for infidelity; and, almost from the first moment, we see her soul gnawed by that longing to be "among those present," which is the hatefullest effect in woman of the contact with great wealth and fashion. She could have a beautiful, refined and truly elect life in the circle in which she is welcomed as the wife of the young architect Littleton; and that light New Yorky spirit, Flossie Williams, can see it and value it from the world in which she gets on and Selma cannot get on. But Selma is not capable of the happiness which her gay friend imagines her; it galls her that Flossie is "among those present," and she is not; and she quarrels with her because of that. Because of that she spoils and embitters her husband's life, and would willingly degrade his art; when he dies, she goes back to the West and marries the lawyer who got her divorce for her. He is now Governor, and can be Senator if he will break his faith with the men who made him Governor. She plays upon his passion with an infernal sophistry, not the less infernal because it is unconscious, and makes him break his faith. The play leaves her in her ugly triumph secure of the Senate, and, for all we know, of the White House.

This is the story of the play which is so fairly representative of the novel. The playing left something to be desired in the clever actress who did Selma with insufficient subtlety, and made her too openly declamatory. The part of Flossie Williams was admirably done, with real truth; and such moments as we had of Governor Lyons were of such pure joy as only the full

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

realization of a type can give. The actor who could suggest without exaggeration, but with such satisfying distinctness, the inner make and outer manner of such an American politician has a future upon which he may be congratulated. The character so perfectly lived before us that, when the poor, flabby old scoundrel burst into a speech from Mrs. Littleton's window, and confirmed to the crowd below the promise of breaking faith which he had given her, one could hardly repress a shudder.

The character of Flossie Williams had more put upon it than it would bear, in the office of persuading the spectators that Selma had lost something in being unfit for fashionable society. She was deficient through her essential hypocrisy, and in meanly longing for what she affected to despise; but the novelist and the playwright failed to give relief to her foible by pretending that she had lost something which could justly be prized. Rich and fashionable society is hardly, in any country, the scene where refined character and ultimated civilization triumph; and it is not better, if not worse, in ours than elsewhere. To the careful observer, its manners seem bad and its morals doubtful; as for its amusements, they appear stupefyingly dull and of the intellectual quality of people who have no real duties or interests. Selma was vulgar at heart, because she wanted a place in it; but her vulgarity would not have disqualified her for a place in it.

VI.

To go from the American to the English plays is to pass from clever sketches, from graphic studies, brilliant suggestions, to finished pictures. It may be that we shall never produce such finished pictures as the English, at least till our conditions have lost their provisional character. Perhaps our drama is the more genuine in sympathizing with the provisionality of our conditions, and it may be that our success is still to be in the line of sketches, studies, suggestions. I thought so when, years ago, I praised the work of Mr. Edward Harrigan; I thought so the other night, after I saw the widow and orphan bargaining off their Paris gowns in Mr. Fitch's play, and perceived that the sketch was worth all the rest of his drama. At any rate, such even perfection as Mr. Pinero's in "The Gay Lord Quex" is yet far before our dramatists; but I believe that it is so not solely because our conditions are provisional. It is so, also, because they have not sought the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

literary quality in their plays which the English dramatists have sought, and which they have found. The drama is distinctly a literary form; it is, in fact, the supreme literary form; but our theatricians have vainly imagined that the presence of literature in it is deleterious; and it must be owned that they have pretty well emptied it of the life that once filled it. I have noted some exceptions to this lamentable superstition; and I will note another in the authors of "Unleavened Bread," who were not afraid to put much of the literary spirit of the book into it. But their work cannot be compared in literary effect to Mr. Pinero's or Mr. Marshall's or Mr. Carton's or Mr. Jones's.

Mr. Marshall's work one already knew from his delightful librettos; and the motive of "A Royal Family" I found a distinct comic opera motive. How much of its charm the pretty drolling owed to the gentle and lovely art of Miss Annie Russell, of course, one was aware; but the piece was so little dependent upon the playing that I should have been quite happy to read it. So should I have been to read "Lady Huntworth's Experiment," which was again very literary, and of a like kindly humorousness. It was more seriously sociological, however, than "A Royal Family," and played with a possible problem, though it failed to reach a solution before it reached the end. How to rehabilitate one's self if one is a woman and has been guiltlessly divorced by a drunken brute of a jealous husband, is a difficult question; and "Lady Huntworth's Experiment" of going *incognito* as cook into a bachelor vicar's family does not so much answer it, as bring out amusing phases of human nature in the vicar, butler and semi-detached visiting officer, who all, together with her divorced husband, want to marry her. The comedy is delicious, and the tragedy is there only as an ingredient to keep the comedy from insipidity.

The problem in Mr. Henry Arthur Jones's play, "Mrs. Dane's Defense," means business indefinitely more than that in "Lady Huntworth's Experiment;" and I do not remember any problem play which so clearly gets the better of its problem. The problem is one well known to the theatre, and consists of the old question of what shall be done with the "erring woman" whose "error" will not be left behind, but insists upon following her into society, and claiming her just at the moment when a fine young fellow has fallen in love with her and wishes to make her his wife. Mrs. Dane's error has been a particularly unhandsome one, and a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rather prolonged one. As governess she wins the love of her pupil's father, and when the wife finds it out she kills herself, and the husband becomes insane from remorse. The girl goes out to Canada, where she takes the name of a dying cousin, and then returns to England, where she finds a place in county society, safe from her past, apparently. But one unhappy witness of it lets it escape him that he thinks she is the notorious Felicia Hindmarsh, and the cat can never afterwards be got quite back into the bag. An implacable aunt of the witness will not hear his protestations that he was misled by a resemblance, and pursues Mrs. Dane with the relentless fury of a virtue that ranges most of the nicest people on Mrs. Dane's side. It must be owned she is a most plausible presence, and that it is no wonder she imposes upon the eminent lawyer, adoptive father of her young lover, who takes her part and has her set her whole history down for him, in order to prove an *alibi*. The great scene of the play—and it *is* a great one—is where her narrative goes to pieces under his benevolent question, and turns out a string of such palpable lies that the man who wished so much to be her friend is forced to convict Mrs. Dane of being Felicia Hindmarsh. His exposure of her to herself is terrible, but altogether righteous, and compact of such good sense and honest frankness as rarely gets on the stage. The miserable soul is of such thorough falseness that she has always pitied herself, and would still like to pose as a victim; she can only realize that she is to be saved from public shame, and may steal away unconvicted if she will. Admirable in every point, this passage is in nothing more admirable than the enforcement of the fact that a certain kind of evil is done only by a certain kind of woman, and that she is never a good woman, no matter how much she is sinned against. Her judge brings this home to the audience rather than to her; she is too false ever to know how bad she is and has been. The part was wonderfully played by Miss Anglin, an actress who contrived with consummate skill to make appreciable the unconscious depravity, the subjective iniquity, of the creature.

Mr. Pinero, in the "Gay Lord Quex," has got a step farther. He has reached the Ibsenian pass of dealing with a predicament, rather than a problem. Here is the case of a nobleman who has spent a sufficiently indefensible youth, and later in life has fallen sincerely in love with a nice girl, but is antagonized by the nice

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

girl's foster sister, a fashionable manicure, and is pursued by the ghost of an old *liaison* in an amusingly romantic duchess, who clings fondly and devotedly to their regrettable past. There is the case, and you are left to make the most of it when the manicure gets herself into an awful box in her attempt to expose Lord Quex by spying and eavesdropping; and he, in a perfectly credible way refrains from his advantage, and lets her go upon the chance of her ruining his hopes of the nice girl. The fact that he gets the nice girl at last, and all ends well, is comparatively unimportant; the most important things in the play are its veracious characterizations, and the wonderful fidelity with which it paints manners. The manners of the nobleman and the manicure toward each other must greatly interest the American student of English civilization; on their different social grades he speaks to her as if she were a baddish boy, or a skulking dog, and she passively accepts this form of address; but when it comes to their flinging social conventions away, and meeting each other in a purely personal quality, she has no more deference for him than he for her; it is a fight between terrier and cat—both English. The scene is really tremendous, and, as Mr. Hare and Miss Vanbrugh play it, there is nothing to be asked either of the drama or the theatre.

VII.

One cannot say this of the American plays or players; and yet one can say much in honest praise of them. At no period of our dramatic history—the term is rather large—has there been so much prospect and so much performance of actual and potential excellence. We have actually advanced, and things are done now by both playwrights and players, and received as matters of cool expectation, which lately would have been acclaimed as surprising triumphs. The advance has been in the right direction, for we must leave out of the account, in the interest of self-respect, the dramatizations of the romantic novels; one *cannot* consider these. But one can consider the sort of plays which I have been speaking of, and find reason for taking courage and taking hope for an American drama. Of course, the great matter is that it should be a *good* drama; but after that point is made, it is for the common advantage that it should be American, for it could not very well be English, with the same promise of fruitfulness and the same fact of raciness. W. D. HOWELLS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED